

CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM FOR FIRST-PASSAGE PERCOLATION TIME ACROSS THIN CYLINDERS

SOURAV CHATTERJEE AND PARTHA S. DEY

ABSTRACT. We prove that first-passage percolation times across thin cylinders of the form $[0, n] \times [-h_n, h_n]^{d-1}$ obey Gaussian central limit theorems as long as h_n grows slower than $n^{1/(d+1)}$. It is an open question as to what is the fastest that h_n can grow so that a Gaussian CLT still holds. We conjecture that $n^{1/(d+1)}$ is the right answer for $d \geq 2$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Before stating our theorems, let us begin with a short review of the first-passage percolation model and some of the known results.

1.1. The model. More than forty years ago, Hammersley and Welsh [11] introduced first-passage percolation to model the spread of fluid through a randomly porous media. The standard first-passage percolation model on the d -dimensional square lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is defined as follows. Consider the edge set E consisting of nearest neighbor edges, that is, $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d$ is an edge if and only if $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| := \sum_{i=1}^d |x_i - y_i| = 1$. With each edge (also called a bond) $e \in E$ is associated an independent nonnegative random variable ω_e distributed according to a fixed distribution F . The random variable ω_e represents the amount of time it takes the fluid to pass through the edge e .

For a path $\mathcal{P}$ (which will always be finite and nearest neighbor) in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ define

$$\omega(\mathcal{P}) := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}} \omega_e$$

as the passage time for $\mathcal{P}$. For $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, called the *first-passage time*, be the minimum passage time over all paths from $\mathbf{x}$ to $\mathbf{y}$. Intuitively $a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is the first time the fluid will appear at $\mathbf{y}$ if a source of water is introduced at the vertex $\mathbf{x}$ at time 0. Formally

$$a(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \inf\{\omega(\mathcal{P}) \mid \mathcal{P} \text{ is a path connecting } \mathbf{x} \text{ to } \mathbf{y} \text{ in } \mathbb{Z}^d\}.$$

The principle object of study in first-passage percolation theory is the asymptotic behavior of $a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{x})$ for fixed $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We refer the reader to Smythe and Wierman [23] and Kesten [16] for earlier surveys of the subject.

Date: December 8, 2009.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 60F05, 60K35;

Key words and phrases. First-passage percolation, Central Limit Theorem, Cylinder Percolation.

1.2. Limit shape. The first result proved by Hammersley and Welsh [11] was that the limit

$$\nu(\mathbf{x}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{x})] \quad (1.1)$$

exists and is finite when $\mathbb{E}[\omega] < \infty$ where ω is a generic random variable from the distribution F . Moreover results of Kesten [16] show that $\nu(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ if and only if $F(0) < p_c(d)$ where $p_c(d)$ is the critical probability for standard bernoulli bond percolation in $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

First-passage percolation is often regarded as a stochastic growth model by considering the growth of the random set

$$B_t := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid a(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}) \leq t\}.$$

When $F(0) = 0$, $a(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a random metric on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and B_t is the ball of radius t in this metric. Moreover, if $F(0) < p_c(d)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\omega^2] < \infty$ (or under weaker conditions in Cox and Durrett [8]), the growth of B_t is linear in t with a deterministic limit shape, that is, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $B_t \approx tB_0 \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ for a nonrandom compact set B_0 . Precisely, the shape theorem says that (see Richardson [22], Cox and Durrett [8] and Kesten [16]), if $F(0) < p_c(d)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\min\{\omega_1^d, \omega_2^d, \dots, \omega_{2d}^d\}] < \infty$ where $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{2d}$ are i.i.d. from F , there is a nonrandom compact set B_0 such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$

$$(1 - \varepsilon)B_0 \subseteq t^{-1}\tilde{B}_t \subseteq (1 + \varepsilon)B_0 \text{ eventually with probability one}$$

where $\tilde{B}_t = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \exists \mathbf{x} \in B_t \text{ s.t. } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\| \leq 1\}$ is the “inflated” version of B_t .

1.3. Fluctuation exponents. In the physics literature, there are mainly two fluctuation exponents χ and ξ that describe, respectively, the longitudinal and transversal fluctuations of the growing surface B_t . For example, it is expected under mild conditions that the first-passage time $a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{x})$ has standard deviation of order n^χ , and the exponent χ is independent of the direction $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. It is also expected that all the paths achieving the minimal time $a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{x})$ deviate from the straight line path joining $\mathbf{0}$ to $n\mathbf{x}$ by distance at most of the order of n^ξ , that is all the minimal paths are expected to lie entirely inside the cylinder centered on the straight line joining $\mathbf{0}$ to $n\mathbf{x}$ whose width is of the order of n^ξ .

In general the exponents χ and ξ are expected to depend only on the dimension d not the distribution F . Moreover they are also conjectured to satisfy the scaling relation $\chi = 2\xi - 1$ for all d (see Krug and Spohn [18]). In fact, the predicted values for $d = 2$ (for models whose exponents are expected to be same in all directions) are $\chi = 1/3$ and $\xi = 2/3$ (see Kardar, Parisi and Zhang [14]). For higher dimensions there are many conflicting predictions. However it is believed that above some finite critical dimension d_c , the exponents satisfy $\chi = 0$ and $\xi = 1/2$.

We briefly describe the rigorous results known about the exponents χ and ξ . The first nontrivial upper bound on the variance of $a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{x})$ was $O(n)$ for all d due to Kesten [17]. The best known upper bound of $n/\log n$ is due to

Benjamini, Kalai and Schramm [3]. In $d = 2$ the best known lower bound of $\log n$ is due to Pemantle and Peres [21] for exponential edge weights, Newman and Piza [20] for general edge weights satisfying $F(0) < p_c(2)$ or $F(\lambda) < p_c^{dir}(2)$ for λ being the smallest point in the support of F where $p_c^{dir}(2)$ is the critical probability for directed Bernoulli bond percolation, and Zhang [26] for $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{e}_1$ and edge weight distributions having finite exponential moments and satisfying $F(\lambda) \geq p_c^{dir}(2)$, $F(\lambda-) = 0$, $\lambda > 0$.

Hence the only nontrivial bound known for χ is $\chi \leq 1/2$. Note that the bound $0 \leq \chi \leq 1/2$ along with the scaling relation (which is unproven) would imply that $1/2 \leq \xi \leq 3/4$. In fact using a closely related exponent χ' which satisfies $\chi' \geq 2\xi - 1$ and $\chi' \leq 1/2$ (see Newman and Piza [20], Kesten [17] and Alexander [1]), it was proved in [20] that $\xi \leq 3/4$ in any dimension for paths in the directions of strict convexity of the limit shape. Moreover, Licea, Newman and Piza [19], comparing appropriate variance bounds, proved that $\xi(d) \geq 1/(d+1)$ for all dimensions d . They also proved that $\xi'(d) \geq 1/2$ for all dimensions d for a related exponent ξ' of ξ .

1.4. Tail bounds and limit theorems. The next natural question is about the tail behavior and distributional convergence of the random variables $a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{x})$ as $\mathbf{x}$ remains fixed and $n \rightarrow \infty$. Kesten [17] used martingale methods to prove that $\mathbb{P}(|a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{e}_1) - \mathbb{E}[a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{e}_1)]| \geq t\sqrt{n}) \leq c_1 e^{-c_2 t}$ for all $t \leq c_3 n$ for some constants $c_i > 0$, where $\mathbf{e}_1$ is the unit vector $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Later, Talagrand [25] used his famous isoperimetric inequality to prove that

$$\mathbb{P}(|a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{x}) - M| \geq t\sqrt{n\|\mathbf{x}\|}) \leq c_1 e^{-c_2 t^2}$$

for all $t \leq c_3 n$ for some constants $c_i > 0$ where M is a median of $a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Both these results were proved for distributions F having finite exponential moments and satisfying $F(0) < p_c(d)$.

From these inequalities, one might naïvely expect that a central limit theorem holds for $a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{x})$. However, the situation is probably much more complex, and it may not be true that a Gaussian CLT holds. For critical first-passage percolation (assuming $F(0) = 1/2$ and F has bounded support) in two dimensions a Gaussian CLT was proved by Newman and Zhang [15]. However, this is sort of a degenerate case since here $\mathbb{E}[a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{x})]$ and $\text{Var}(a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{x}))$ are both of order $\log n$ (see Chayes, Chayes and Durrett [7], and Newman and Zhang [15]). When $F(0) < 1/2$, we do not know of any distributional convergence result in any dimension.

Convergence to the Tracy-Widom law is known for *directed* last-passage percolation in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ under very special conditions (see Subsection 1.6 for details), but the techniques do not carry over to the undirected case. Naturally, one may expect that convergence to something like the Tracy-Widom distribution may hold for undirected first-passage percolation also, but surprisingly, this does not seem to be the case. In the following subsection, we present our main result: a Gaussian CLT for undirected first-passage percolation when the paths are restricted to lie in thin cylinders. This gives

rise to an interesting question: as the cylinders become thicker, when does the CLT break down, if it does?

1.5. Our results. We consider first-passage percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with height restricted by an integer h (that will be allowed to grow with n). We assume that the edge weight distribution F satisfies a standard admissibility criterion, defined below.

Definition 1.1. *Given the dimension d , we call a probability distribution function F on the real line admissible if F is supported on $[0, \infty)$, is non-degenerate and we have $F(\lambda) < p_c(d)$ where λ is the smallest point in the support of F and $p_c(d)$ is the critical probability for Bernoulli bond percolation in $\mathbb{Z}^d$.*

For simplicity we will consider only first-passage time from $\mathbf{0}$ to $n\mathbf{e}_1$ where $\mathbf{e}_1$ is the first coordinate vector. The same method can be used to prove similar results for $a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{x})$ where $\mathbf{x}$ has rational coordinates. Define $a_n(h)$ as the first-passage time to the point $n\mathbf{e}_1$ from the origin in the graph $\mathbb{Z} \times [-h, h]^{d-1}$, formally

$$a_n(h) := \inf\{\omega(\mathcal{P}) \mid \mathcal{P} \text{ is a path from } \mathbf{0} \text{ to } n\mathbf{e}_1 \text{ in } \mathbb{Z} \times [-h, h]^{d-1}\}.$$

Here, by $[-h, h]$ we mean the subset $[-h, h] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ of $\mathbb{Z}$. Informally, $a_n(h)$ is the minimal passage time over all paths which deviate from the straight line path joining the two end points by a distance at most h . Note that by the definition of the exponent ξ we have $a_n(h) = a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{e}_1)$ with high probability when $h \gg n^\xi$. We also consider cylinder first-passage time (see Smyth and Wierman [23], Grimmett and Kesten [10]). A path $\mathcal{P}$ from $\mathbf{0}$ to $n\mathbf{e}_1$ is called a cylinder path if it is contained within the $x_1 = 0$ and $x_1 = n$ planes. We define

$$t_n(h) := \inf\{\omega(\mathcal{P}) \mid \mathcal{P} \text{ is a path from } \mathbf{0} \text{ to } n\mathbf{e}_1 \text{ in } [0, n] \times [-h, h]^{d-1}\} \text{ and}$$

$$T_n(h) := \inf\{\omega(\mathcal{P}) \mid \mathcal{P} \text{ is a path connecting } \{0\} \times [-h, h]^{d-1} \text{ and}$$

$$\{n\} \times [-h, h]^{d-1} \text{ in } [0, n] \times [-h, h]^{d-1}\}.$$

Clearly $a_n(h)$, $t_n(h)$ and $T_n(h)$ are non-increasing in h for any $n \geq 1$. Our main result is that for cylinders that are ‘thin’ enough, we have Gaussian CLTs for $a_n(h)$, $t_n(h)$ and $T_n(h)$ after proper centering and scaling.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that the edge-weights ω_e ’s are i.i.d. random variables from an admissible distribution F . Suppose $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for some $p > 2$. Let $\{h_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of integers satisfying $h_n = o(n^\alpha)$ where*

$$\alpha < \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d+1+\frac{2p(d-1)}{p-2}} & \text{if } 2 < p < 4, \\ \frac{1}{d+1+\frac{d-1}{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor - 1}} & \text{if } p \geq 4. \end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$\frac{a_n(h_n) - \mathbb{E}[a_n(h_n)]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(a_n(h_n))}} \implies N(0, 1) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In particular, if $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for all $p \geq 1$ then the CLT holds when $h_n = o(n^\alpha)$ with $\alpha < 1/(d+1)$. If $h_n = O(1)$ then the $F(\lambda) < p_c(d)$ condition is not needed. Moreover, the same result is true for $t_n(h_n)$ and $T_n(h_n)$.

In Section 2, we will present a generalization of this result (Theorem 2.1) to cylinders of the form $\mathbb{Z} \times G_n$ where $\{G_n\}$ is an arbitrary sequence of undirected connected graphs.

Theorem 1.1 give rise to a new exponent $\gamma(d)$ defined as

$$\gamma(d) := \sup \left\{ \alpha : \frac{a_n(n^\alpha) - \mathbb{E}[a_n(n^\alpha)]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(a_n(n^\alpha))}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \right\}.$$

Clearly we have $\gamma(d) \geq 1/(d+1)$ for F having all moments finite and satisfying the conditions in Theorem 1.1. Is $\gamma(d)$ actually equal to $1/(d+1)$? There are indications that this is true; in fact, for $d = 2$, we are almost certain that this is the correct value.

Conjecture 1.2. *For any $d \geq 2$, $\gamma(d) = 1/(d+1)$.*

An interesting feature of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is that while it is relatively easy to get a CLT for cylinders of width n^α for α sufficiently small, to go all the way up to $\alpha = 1/(d+1)$ one needs a somewhat complicated ‘renormalization’ argument that has to be taken to a certain depth of recursion, where the depth depends on how close α is to $1/(d+1)$. We are not sure whether this renormalization step is fundamental to the problem or just an artifact of our proof.

A deficiency of Theorem 1.1 is that we do not have formulas for the mean and the variance of $a_n(h_n)$. Still, we have something: the following result states that under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1 the mean grows linearly with n and the growth rate does not depend on h_n as long as $h_n \rightarrow \infty$. It also gives upper and lower bounds for the variance of $a_n(h_n)$.

Proposition 1.3. *Let $\mu_n(h_n)$ and $\sigma_n^2(h_n)$ be the mean and variance of $a_n(h_n)$. Assume that $h_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_n(h_n)}{n} = \nu(e_1),$$

where $\nu(e_1)$ is defined as in (1.1). Moreover, if F is admissible we have

$$c_1 \frac{n}{h_n^{d-1}} \leq \sigma_n^2(h_n) \leq c_2 n$$

for some absolute constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ depending only on d and F . If $h_n = h$ for all n for fixed $h \in (0, \infty)$, then both $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(h)/n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_n^2(h)/n$ exist and are positive for any non-degenerate distribution F on $[0, \infty)$, but their values depend on h .

In fact when $h_n = h$ for all n for fixed $h \in (0, \infty)$, we can say much more. Define $\mu(h) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(h)/n$ and $\sigma^2(h) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_n^2(h)/n$. Existence of the limits follow from Proposition 1.3. Now consider the continuous process

$X(\cdot)$ defined by $X(n) = t_n(h) - n\mu(h)$ for $n \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ and extended by linear interpolation. Then we have the following result.

Proposition 1.4. *Assume that $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for some $p > 2$ where $\omega \sim F$. Then the scaled process $\{(n\sigma^2(h))^{-1/2}X(nt)\}_{t \geq 0}$ converges in distribution to the standard Brownian motion as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Finally let us mention that a variant of Theorem 1.1 can be proved for the first-passage *site* percolation model also. Here instead of edge-weights $\{\omega_e \mid e \in E\}$ we have vertex weights $\{\omega_{\mathbf{x}} \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ and travel time for a path $\mathcal{P}$ is defined by $\omega(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{P}} \omega_v$. The same proof technique should work.

1.6. Comparison with directed last-passage percolation. In all the previous discussions we used undirected first-passage times. A directed model is obtained when instead of all paths, one considers only directed paths. A directed path is a path that moves only in the positive direction at each step (e.g. in $d = 2$, the path moves only up and right). Let us restrict ourselves to $d = 2$ henceforth. The directed (site/bond) last-passage time to the point (n, h) starting from the origin is defined as

$$L_{\uparrow}^s(n, h) := \sup\{\omega(\mathcal{P}) \mid \mathcal{P} \in \Pi(n, h)\},$$

where $\Pi(n, h)$ is the set of all directed paths from $(0, 0)$ to (n, h) . Note that all the paths in $\Pi(n, h)$ are inside the rectangle $[0, n] \times [0, h]$.

The directed last-passage site percolation model in $d = 2$ has received particular attention in recent years, due to its myriad connections with the totally asymmetric simple exclusion process, queuing theory and random matrix theory. An important breakthrough, due to Johansson [12], says that when the vertex weights $\omega_{\mathbf{x}}$'s are i.i.d. geometric random variables, $L_{\uparrow}^s(n, n)$ has fluctuations of order $n^{1/3}$ and has the same limiting distribution as the largest eigenvalue of a GUE random matrix upon proper centering and scaling. (This is also known as the Tracy-Widom law.) Moreover, this holds if we replace $L_{\uparrow}^s(n, n)$ with $L_{\uparrow}^s(n, \lfloor \rho n \rfloor)$ for any $\rho \in (0, 1]$. This continues to hold if one replaces geometric by exponential or bernoulli random variables [9, 13], but no greater generality has been proved.

Since the above result holds for arbitrary $\rho > 0$, one can speculate whether we can actually take $\rho \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. look at directed last-passage percolation in thin rectangles. Indeed, the analog of Johansson's result in this setting was proved by several authors [2, 5, 24] in recent years for quite a general class of vertex weight distributions, provided the rectangles are 'thin' enough. This contrasts starkly with our result about the Gaussian behavior of first-passage percolation in thin rectangles.

1.7. Structure of the paper. The article is organized in the following way. In Section 2 we state a general result that encompasses Theorem 1.1. In Section 3 we prove the asymptotic behavior of the mean of $a_n(G_n)$. Sections 4 and 5 contain, respectively, the lower bound for the variance and

upper bounds for general central moments of $a_n(G_n)$. In Section 6 we prove the generalized version of Theorem 1.1. Finally in Section 7 we consider the case of first-passage time across $[0, n] \times G$ when G is a fixed graph.

2. GENERALIZATION

In this section, we generalize the theorems of Section 1 to first-passage percolation on graphs on the form $\mathbb{Z} \times G_n$, where $\{G_n\}$ is an arbitrary increasing sequence of undirected graphs.

Before stating the results, let us fix our notations. The set $\{a, a+1, \dots, b\}$ with the nearest neighbor graph structure will be denoted by $[a, b]$. When $a = 0$, we will simply write $[b]$ instead of $[0, b]$. Throughout the rest of the article we will consider the undirected first-passage bond percolation model with edge weight distribution F , as defined in the previous section. Let μ and σ^2 be the mean and the variance of F . We will use the standard notations $a_n = O(b_n)$ and $a_n = o(b_n)$, respectively, in the case $\sup_{n \geq 1} a_n/b_n < \infty$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = 0$.

For two finite connected graphs H and G , we define the product graph structure on $H \times G$ in the natural way, that is, there is an edge between (u, w) and (v, z) if and only if either (u, v) is an edge in H and $w = z$, or $u = v$ and (w, z) is an edge in G .

We will consider first-passage percolation on a special class of product graphs. Fix an integer n and a connected graph G with a distinguished vertex $o \in G$. Let $a_n(G)$ denote the first-passage time from $(0, o)$ to (n, o) in $\mathbb{Z} \times G$. That is,

$$a_n(G) := \inf\{\omega(\mathcal{P}) \mid \mathcal{P} \text{ is a path from } (0, o) \text{ to } (n, o) \text{ in } \mathbb{Z} \times G\}$$

where $\omega(\mathcal{P}) := \sum_{e \in \mathcal{P}} \omega_e$ is weight of the path $\mathcal{P}$. We define the cylinder first-passage time $t_n(G)$ as

$$t_n(G) := \inf\{\omega(\mathcal{P}) : \mathcal{P} \text{ is a path from } (0, o) \text{ to } (n, o) \text{ in } [0, n] \times G\}.$$

We also define the side-to-side (cylinder) first-passage time as follows:

$$T_{a,b}(G) := \min\{\omega(\mathcal{P}) \mid \mathcal{P} \text{ is a path connecting the two sides } \{a\} \times G \text{ and } \{b\} \times G \text{ in } [a, b] \times G\}, \quad (2.1)$$

that is, $T_{a,b}(G)$ is the minimum weight among all paths that join the right boundary of the product graph $[a, b] \times G$ to the left boundary of it. Note that it is enough to consider only those paths that start from some vertex in $\{a\} \times G$ and end at some vertex in $\{b\} \times G$, and lie in the set $[a+1, b-1] \times G$ throughout except for the first and last edges. One implication of this fact is that $T_{a,b}(G)$ is independent of the weights of the edges in the left and right boundaries $\{a\} \times G, \{b\} \times G$. We will write $T_{0,n}(G)$ simply as $T_n(G)$.

Now consider a nondecreasing sequence of connected graphs $G_n = (V_n, E_n)$, $n \geq 1$. By ‘nondecreasing’ we mean that G_n is a subgraph (need not be induced) of G_{n+1} for all n . Let o be a distinguished vertex in G_1 , which we

will call the *origin* of G_1 . Then $o \in G_n$ for all n . Let k_n and d_n be the number of edges and the diameter of G_n , respectively.

Our object of study is first-passage percolation on the product graph $\mathbb{Z} \times G_n$ with i.i.d. edge weights from the distribution F . In particular, we wish to understand the behavior of the first-passage time $a_n(G_n)$ from $(0, o)$ to (n, o) .

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 2.1. *Let G_n be a nondecreasing sequence of connected graphs with a fixed origin o . Let d_n and k_n be the diameter and the number of edges in G_n . Suppose that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $k_n = O(d_n^\theta)$ for some fixed $\theta \geq 1$. Let $a_n(G_n)$ be the first-passage percolation time from $(0, o)$ to (n, o) in the graph $\mathbb{Z} \times G_n$. Suppose that a generic edge weight ω satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for some $p > 2$. Then we have*

$$\frac{a_n(G_n) - \mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)]}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(a_n(G_n))}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ provided one of following holds:

- A. There is a fixed connected graph G such that $G_n = G$ for all $n \geq 1$, or
- B. G_n 's are connected subgraphs of $\mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$ for some $d > 1$, the edge weight distribution is admissible and $d_n = o(n^\alpha)$, where

$$\alpha < \frac{1}{2 + \theta + \theta \min\{\frac{2p}{p-2}, \frac{1}{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor - 1}\}}.$$

Moreover, the same result holds for $t_n(G_n), T_n(G_n)$ in place of $a_n(G_n)$.

Clearly, this theorem implies Theorem 1.1 by taking $G_n = [-h_n, h_n]^{d-1}$ with $d_n = 2h_n(d-1)^{1/2}$ and $\theta = d-1$. Throughout the rest of the paper we will consider the case of general sequence G_n .

As we remarked earlier we do not have explicit formulas for the mean and the variance of $a_n(G_n)$. The following result is the generalization of the ‘mean part’ of Proposition 1.3.

Proposition 2.1. *Consider the setup introduced above. Then the limit*

$$\nu := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)]$$

exists and we have

$$\nu n \leq \mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)] \leq \mu n \text{ for all } n.$$

Moreover, $\nu > 0$ if $G_n = G$ for all $n \geq 1$ or G_n 's are subgraphs of $\mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$ and $F(0) < p_c(d)$. In particular, when $G_n = [-h_n, h_n]^{d-1}$ and $h_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\nu = \nu(e_1)$, where $\nu(e_1)$ is defined as in (1.1). We also have

$$\mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)] \leq \mathbb{E}[t_n(G_n)] \leq \mathbb{E}[T_n(G_n)] + 2\mu d_n \leq \mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)] + 2\mu d_n$$

for all n .

Now let us state the upper and lower bounds for the variance of $a_n(G_n)$, i.e. the ‘variance part’ of Proposition 1.3.

Proposition 2.2. *Under the condition of Theorem 2.1 we have*

$$c_1 \frac{n}{k_n} \leq \text{Var}(a_n(G_n)) \leq c_2 n$$

for some positive constants c_1, c_2 that do not depend on n . Moreover, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(a_n(G_n))/n$ exists for all non-degenerate distribution F on $[0, \infty)$ when $G_n = G$ for all n . The above results hold for $t_n(G_n)$ and $T_n(G_n)$.

In fact when $G_n = G$ for all $n \geq 1$, we can say much more as in Proposition 1.4. Define

$$\mu(G) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[a_n(G)]}{n} \text{ and } \sigma^2(G) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Var}(a_n(G))}{n}. \quad (2.2)$$

Existence and positivity of the limits follow from Propositions 2.1 and 2.2. Consider the continuous process $X(\cdot)$ defined by $X(n) = t_n(G) - n\mu(G)$ for $n \geq 0$ and extended by linear interpolation. Then we have the following result.

Proposition 2.3. *Assume that the generic edge weight ω is non-degenerate and satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for some $p > 2$. Then the scaled process*

$$\{(n\sigma^2(G))^{-1/2} X(nt)\}_{t \geq 0}$$

converges in distribution to the standard Brownian motion as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

3. ESTIMATES FOR THE MEAN

In this section we will prove Proposition 2.1. We will break the proof into several lemmas. Lemma 3.1 shows that the random variables $a_n(G_n), t_n(G_n)$ and $T_n(G_n)$ are close in L^p norm when the diameter d_n of G_n is small.

Lemma 3.1. *We have*

$$T_n(G_n) \leq a_n(G_n) \leq t_n(G_n) \text{ for all } n.$$

Moreover we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|t_n(G_n) - T_n(G_n)|^p] \leq 2^p d_n^p \mathbb{E}[\omega^p] \text{ for all } n \geq 1$$

when $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for some $p \geq 1$ and a typical edge weight $\omega \sim F$.

Proof. Fix any path $\mathcal{P}$ from $(0, o)$ to (n, o) in $\mathbb{Z} \times G_n$. The path $\mathcal{P}$ will hit $\{0\} \times G_n$ and $\{n\} \times G_n$ at some vertices. Let $(0, u)$ be the vertex where $\mathcal{P}$ hits $\{0\} \times G_n$ the last time and (n, v) be the vertex where $\mathcal{P}$ hits $\{n\} \times G_n$ the first time after hitting $(0, u)$. The path segment of $\mathcal{P}$ from $(0, u)$ to (n, v) lies inside $[n] \times G_n$ and by non-negativity of edge weights we have $\omega(\mathcal{P}) \geq T_n(G_n)$. Since this is true for any path $\mathcal{P}$ joining $(0, o)$ to (n, o) in $\mathbb{Z} \times G_n$, we have $T_n(G_n) \leq a_n(G_n)$.

Clearly $a_n(G_n) \leq t_n(G_n)$. Combining the two inequalities, we see that

$$T_n(G_n) \leq a_n(G_n) \leq t_n(G_n) \text{ for all } n.$$

Since the number of paths joining the left side $\{0\} \times G_n$ to the right side $\{n\} \times G_n$ in $[0, n] \times G_n$ is finite there is a path achieving the minimal weight $T_n(G_n)$. Choose such a path $\mathcal{P}^*$ using a deterministic rule. Suppose that the path $\mathcal{P}^*$ starts at $(0, u)$ and ends at (n, w) . As we remarked earlier in Section 2 the random variables $T_n(G_n), \mathcal{P}^*, u, w$ are independent of the edge weights ω_e where e is an edge in $\{0\} \times G_n$ or $\{n\} \times G_n$.

Let $\mathcal{P}(u), \mathcal{P}(w)$ be some minimal length paths in G_n joining o, u and o, w respectively. We have $t_n(G_n) - T_n(G_n) \leq S_n$ where S_n is the sum of edge weights in the paths $\{0\} \times \mathcal{P}(u)$ and $\{n\} \times \mathcal{P}(w)$ and hence

$$\mathbb{E}[|t_n(G_n) - T_n(G_n)|^p] \leq \mathbb{E}[S_n^p].$$

Moreover by independence of u, w and the edge weights in $\{0, n\} \times G_n$ we have $\mathbb{E}[S_n^p | u, w] \leq (|\mathcal{P}(u)| + |\mathcal{P}(w)|)^p \mathbb{E}[\omega^p]$. By definition of diameter we have $|\mathcal{P}(u)| + |\mathcal{P}(w)| \leq 2d_n$ and thus we are done. $\square$

The following lemma combined with Lemma 3.1 completes half of the proof of Proposition 2.1. Recall that $\{G_n\}$ is a nondecreasing sequence of finite connected graphs.

Lemma 3.2. *The limit*

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)]}{n}$$

exists and we have

$$\nu n \leq \mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)] \leq \mu n \text{ for all } n.$$

Moreover, we have $\nu < \mu$ if $d_n \geq 1$ and F is non-degenerate.

Proof. Considering the straight line path from $(0, o)$ to (n, o) it is easy to see that $\mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)] \leq \mu n$. The existence of the limit is easily obtained from subadditivity as follows. Fix n, m . Consider G_n and G_m as subgraphs of G_{n+m} . Let $a_{n,n+m}(G_m)$ denote the first-passage time in $\mathbb{Z} \times G_m$ from (n, o) to $(n+m, o)$. Clearly $a_{n,n+m}(G_m) \stackrel{d}{=} a_m(G_m)$. Joining the minimal weight paths from $(0, o)$ to (n, o) achieving the weight $a_n(G_n)$ and from (n, o) to $(n+m, o)$ achieving the weight $a_{n,n+m}(G_m)$, we get a path in $\mathbb{Z} \times G_{n+m}$ from $(0, o)$ to $(n+m, o)$. Clearly

$$a_{n+m}(G_{n+m}) \leq a_n(G_n) + a_{n,n+m}(G_m).$$

Now taking expectation in both sides and using the subadditive lemma we have

$$\nu := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)]}{n}$$

exists and equals $\inf_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)]/n$.

To show that $\nu < \mu$ it is enough to consider the one edge graph $G_n = G = \{0, 1\}$ and n even. Consider the following two paths from $(0, 0)$ to $(2n, 0)$. One is the straight line path. The other is the path connecting $(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1), (1, 0), (2, 0)$ and repeating the same pattern. Clearly we

have $\mathbb{E}[a_{2n}(G)] \leq \mu n + n \mathbb{E}[\min\{\omega_1, \omega_2 + \omega_3 + \omega_4\}]$ where ω_i 's are i.i.d. from F . From here it is easy to see that $\nu < \mu$. $\square$

We complete the proof of Proposition 2.1 by finding lower bound for ν under appropriate conditions. Recall that $\nu(\mathbf{e}_1) > 0$ iff $F(0) < p_c(d)$ where $\mathbf{e}_1$ is the first coordinate vector in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\nu(\mathbf{x})$ is defined as in (1.1).

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose G_n 's are subgraphs of $\mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$. Then the limit ν in Lemma 3.2 satisfies*

$$\nu \geq \nu(\mathbf{e}_1)$$

where $\nu(\mathbf{e}_1)$ is as defined in (1.1). Equality holds when $G_n = [-h_n, h_n]^{d-1}$ with $h_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, the limit ν is positive if $G_n = G$ for all n .

Proof. First suppose that $G_n = G$ for all n and G has v vertices. It is easy to see that $\mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)] \geq n \mathbb{E}[Y]$ where Y is the minimum of v i.i.d. random variables each having distribution F , because any path from $(0, o)$ to (n, o) must contain at least one edge of the form $((k, u), (k+1, u))$ for each $k = 0, \dots, n-1$. Since $\mathbb{E}[Y] > 0$, it follows that $\nu > 0$.

Now consider the case when G_n 's are subgraphs of $\mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$ (we will match o with the origin in $\mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$). Then $\mathbb{Z} \times G_n$ is a subgraph of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $(0, o) = \mathbf{0}$ and $(n, o) = n\mathbf{e}_1$ where $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{e}_1$ denote the origin and the first coordinate vector in $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Clearly we have $a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{e}_1) \leq a_n(G_n)$ for all n . Diving both sides by n and taking expectations we have

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)] \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[a(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{e}_1)] = \nu(\mathbf{e}_1).$$

To prove that $\nu = \nu(\mathbf{e}_1)$ when $G_n = [-h_n, h_n]^{d-1}$, break the cylinder graph $[n] \times G_n$ into smaller cylinder graphs of length $\lfloor l_n/C \rfloor$ for some fixed constant $C > 0$ where $l_n = \min\{n^{1/2}, h_n\}$. Note that concatenating paths from $(il_n/C, o)$ to $((i+1)l_n/C, o)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots$ we get a path from $(0, o)$ to (n, o) . Let $n = m\lfloor l_n/C \rfloor + r$ with $r < \lfloor l_n/C \rfloor$. Thus we have

$$\mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)] \leq m \mathbb{E}[X(\lfloor l_n/C \rfloor, l_n)] + \mathbb{E}[X(r, l_n)] \quad (3.1)$$

where

$X(n, h) := \inf\{\omega(\mathcal{P}) \mid \mathcal{P} \text{ is a path from } (0, o) \text{ to } (n, o) \text{ that lies in the rectangle } [1, n-1] \times [-h, h]^{d-1} \text{ except for the first and last edge}\}.$

Dividing both sides of (3.1) by n and taking limits (note $l_n = o(n)$ and $l_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$) we have

$$\nu := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[X(\lfloor n/C \rfloor, n)]}{\lfloor n/C \rfloor} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[X(n, \lfloor Cn \rfloor)]}{n}$$

for any $C > 0$. The last limit exists by subadditivity. Denote the last limit by $\alpha(C)$ which also satisfies $\alpha(C) = \inf_n \mathbb{E}[X(n, \lfloor Cn \rfloor)]/n$. Now let us consider the unrestricted cylinder percolation time $t(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{e}_1)$ defined as the minimum weight among all paths from $\mathbf{0}$ to $n\mathbf{e}_1$ lying in the vertical strip

$0 < x_1 < n$ except for the first and the last edge. From standard results in first-passage percolation theory (see Section 5.1 in Smythe and Wierman [23] for a proof) we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[t(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{e}_1)] = \nu(\mathbf{e}_1).$$

Now for fixed n , the random variables $X(n, \lfloor Cn \rfloor)$ are decreasing in C and $t(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{e}_1) = \lim_{C \rightarrow \infty} X(n, \lfloor Cn \rfloor)$. By monotone convergence theorem we have

$$\mathbb{E}[t(\mathbf{0}, n\mathbf{e}_1)] = \lim_{C \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X(n, \lfloor Cn \rfloor)] \geq \limsup_{C \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(C)n \geq \nu n.$$

Dividing both sides by n and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ we are done. $\square$

4. LOWER BOUND FOR THE VARIANCE

Here we will prove the lower bound for the variance given in Proposition 2.2. First we will prove a uniform lower bound that holds for any n and G . Later we will specialize to the case $G = G_n$ for given n .

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be a subgraph of $\mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$ with diameter D and number of edges k . Let F be admissible. Then we have*

$$\text{Var}(t_n(G)) \geq c_1 \frac{n}{k} \text{ and } \text{Var}(T_n(G)) \geq c_1 \frac{n}{k} \left(1 - c_2 \frac{D}{n}\right) \quad (4.1)$$

for some absolute positive constants c_1, c_2 that depend only on d and F . The same result holds for all nondegenerate probability distributions F on $[0, \infty)$ with c_i depending only on G and F . In particular, when $D \leq n/(2c_2)$ we have

$$\text{Var}(T_n(G)) \geq c_3 \frac{n}{k}$$

for all n, k for some absolute constant $c_3 > 0$.

Proof. Fix G and n . Let v be the number of vertices in G . Let $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_N\}$ be a fixed enumeration of the edges in $[n] \times G$ where $N = (n+1)k + nv$ is the number of edges in that graph. For simplicity let us write $t_n(G)$ simply as t . Let $\mathcal{F}_i$ be the sigma-algebra generated by $\{\omega(e_1), \omega(e_2), \dots, \omega(e_i)\}$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, N$. For simplicity we will write ω_i instead of $\omega(e_i)$. Also we will write $t(\omega)$ to explicitly write the dependence of t on the sequence of edge-weights $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_N)$.

Using Doob's martingale decomposition we can write the random variable $t - \mathbb{E}[t]$ as a sum of martingale difference sequences $\mathbb{E}[t|\mathcal{F}_i] - \mathbb{E}[t|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}]$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Since martingale difference sequences are uncorrelated we have the standard identity

$$\text{Var}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[t|\mathcal{F}_i] - \mathbb{E}[t|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}]).$$

For $1 \leq i \leq N$, let $\hat{\omega}^i$ denote the sequence of edge-weights ω excluding the weight ω_i . Moreover, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we will write $(\hat{\omega}^i, x)$ to denote the

sequence of edge-weights where the weight of the edge e_j is ω_j for $j \neq i$ and x for $j = i$. Clearly we have $\omega = (\hat{\omega}^i, \omega_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. If η is a random variable distributed as F and is independent of ω , then we have $\mathbb{E}[t|\mathcal{F}_i] - \mathbb{E}[t|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = \mathbb{E}[t(\hat{\omega}^i, \omega_i) - t(\hat{\omega}^i, \eta)|\mathcal{F}_i]$. It is easy to see that (as $\text{Var}(t) \geq \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[t|\mathcal{F}])$)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[t(\hat{\omega}^i, \omega_i) - t(\hat{\omega}^i, \eta)|\mathcal{F}_i]) &\geq \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[t(\hat{\omega}^i, \omega_i) - t(\hat{\omega}^i, \eta)|\mathcal{F}_i]|\omega_i]) \\ &= \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[t(\omega)|\omega_i]). \end{aligned}$$

Now for any random variable X we have $\text{Var}(X) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}(X_1 - X_2)^2$ where X_1, X_2 are i.i.d. copies of X . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[t(\omega)|\omega_i]) &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[t(\hat{\omega}^i, \omega_i) - t(\hat{\omega}^i, \eta)|\omega_i, \eta])^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_i > \eta\}} \mathbb{E}[t(\hat{\omega}^i, \omega_i) - t(\hat{\omega}^i, \eta)|\omega_i, \eta])^2] \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where in the last line we have used the fact that ω_i and η are i.i.d. Define

$$\Delta_i := \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_i > \eta\}}(t(\hat{\omega}^i, \omega_i) - t(\hat{\omega}^i, \eta))|\omega] \quad (4.3)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. From (4.2) we have $\text{Var}(\mathbb{E}[t(\omega)|\omega_i]) \geq (\mathbb{E}[\Delta_i])^2$ for all i . Combining we have

$$\text{Var}(t) \geq \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbb{E}[\Delta_i])^2 \geq \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\Delta_i] \right)^2 = \frac{1}{N} (\mathbb{E}[g(\omega)])^2$$

where

$$g(\omega) := \sum_{i=1}^N \Delta_i = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_i > \eta\}}(t(\omega) - t(\hat{\omega}^i, \eta))|\omega].$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_*(\omega)$ be a minimum weight path for ω chosen according to a deterministic rule. If the edge e_i is in $\mathcal{P}_*(\omega)$, we have

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_i > \eta\}}(t(\omega) - t(\hat{\omega}^i, \eta)) \geq \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega_i > \eta\}}(\omega_i - \eta) = (\omega_i - \eta)_+$$

as the weight of the path $\mathcal{P}_*(\omega)$ for the configuration $(\hat{\omega}^i, \eta)$ is $t(\omega) - \omega_i + \eta$. Thus we have

$$g(\omega) \geq \sum_{i: e_i \in \mathcal{P}_*(\omega)} \mathbb{E}[(\omega_i - \eta)_+|\omega_i]. \quad (4.4)$$

Now define the function

$$h(x) = \mathbb{E}[(x - \eta)_+] \text{ where } \eta \sim F.$$

It is easy to see that $h(x) = 0$ iff $x \leq \lambda$ where λ is the smallest point in the support of F and $\mathbb{E}[h(\omega)] < \infty$.

Define a new set of edge weights $\omega'_i = h(\omega_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ with distribution function F' . Clearly ω'_i 's are i.i.d. with $F'(0) = \mathbb{P}(h(\omega) = 0) = \mathbb{P}(\omega = \lambda)$. Moreover let $t(\omega')$ be the cylinder first-passage time from $(0, o)$ to (n, o) in $[0, n] \times G$ with edge weights ω' . From (4.4) we have $g(\omega) \geq t(\omega')$. Now from Lemma 3.2 and 3.3 we have $\mathbb{E}[t(\omega')] \geq \nu'(\mathbf{e}_1)n$ where $\nu'(\mathbf{e}_1)$ is as defined in (1.1) with edge weight distribution F' and $\nu'(\mathbf{e}_1) > 0$ as

$F'(0) < p_c(d)$. Also note that $N = (n+1)k + nv \leq 3nk$. Thus, finally we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \text{Var}(t) \geq \frac{1}{3k} \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[t(\omega')]}{n} \right)^2 \geq \frac{\nu'(e_1)^2}{3k}. \quad (4.5)$$

Now assume that F is any non-degenerate distribution supported on $[0, \infty)$. From Lemma 3.3 we can see that $\mathbb{E}[t_n(G)] \geq cn$ for all n for some constant $c > 0$ depending on G and F . Thus we are done.

To prove the result for $T_n(G)$ we start with $T_n(G)$ in place of $t_n(G)$ and use $\mathbb{E}[T_n(G)] \geq \mathbb{E}[t_n(G)] - 2\mu D$ from Lemma 3.1 in (4.5). $\square$

Proof of the lower bound in Proposition 2.2. From Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Var}(a_n(G_n))^{1/2} - \text{Var}(t_n(G_n))^{1/2}| &\leq (\mathbb{E}[|a_n(G_n) - t_n(G_n)|^2])^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2d_n(\mu^2 + \sigma^2)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Now under Theorem 2.1 we have $d_n = o(n^{1/(2+\theta)})$ which clearly implies that $d_n^2 = o(n/k_n)$ as $k_n = O(d_n^\theta)$. Thus by Lemma 4.1 we are done. Using Lemma 5.5 one can drop the condition $d_n = o(n^{1/(2+\theta)})$ when F is admissible. $\square$

5. UPPER BOUND FOR CENTRAL MOMENTS

In this section we will prove upper bounds for central moments of $a_n(G_n)$, $t_n(G_n)$ and $T_n(G_n)$, in particular the upper bound for variance of $a_n(G_n)$ stated in Proposition 2.2. Note that by Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|t_n(G_n) - a_n(G_n)|^p] \leq \mathbb{E}[|t_n(G_n) - T_n(G_n)|^p] \leq \mathbb{E}[(2d_n\omega)^p]$$

for all n when $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for some $p \geq 2$ with $\omega \sim F$. Hence it is enough to prove bounds for $\mathbb{E}[|t_n(G_n) - \mathbb{E}[t_n(G_n)]|^p]$.

Fix $n \geq 1$ and a finite connected graph G . We will prove the following.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for some $p \geq 2$ and $F(0) < p_c(d)$ where $\omega \sim F$. Also suppose that G is a finite subgraph of $\mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$. Then for any $n \geq 1$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[|t_n(G) - \mathbb{E}[t_n(G)]|^p] \leq cn^{p/2}$$

where c is a constant depending only on p, d and F . Moreover, the same result holds with c depending on G without any restriction on $F(0)$. The above result holds for $a_n(G)$ and $T_n(G)$ when

$$D \leq Cn^{1/2}$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$ where D is the diameter of G .

When F has finite exponential moments in some neighborhood of zero, one can use Talagrand's [25] strong concentration inequality along with Kesten's Lemma 5.5 to prove a much stronger result $\mathbb{P}(|t_n(G) - \mathbb{E}[t_n(G)]| \geq x) \leq 4e^{-c_1 x^2/n}$ for $x \leq c_2 n$ for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Moreover, one can use moment inequalities due to Boucheron, Bousquet, Lugosi and Massart [6]

to prove that the p -th moment is bounded by $n^{p/2}k^{p/2-1}$ for $p \geq 2$. But none of that gives what we need for the proof of Theorem 2.1, so we have to devise our own proof of Proposition 5.2.

The next two technical lemmas will be useful in the proof of Proposition 5.1. Proofs of the two technical lemmas and of Proposition 5.1 are given at the end of this section.

Lemma 5.2. *For any $p > 2$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$|x|^{p-2} - y|y|^{p-2} \leq \max\{1, (p-1)/2\}|x-y|(|x|^{p-2} + |y|^{p-2}).$$

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\beta > 1, a, b \geq 0$. Let $y \geq 0$ satisfy $y^\beta \leq a + by$. Then*

$$y^{\beta-1} \leq a^{(\beta-1)/\beta} + b.$$

Before proving Proposition 5.1 we need to define a new random variable $L_n(G)$. Consider cylinder first-passage time $t_n(G)$ in $[n] \times G$. Call a path $\mathcal{P}$ from $(0, o)$ to (n, o) in $[n] \times G$ a weight minimizing path if its weight $\omega(\mathcal{P})$ equals $t_n(G)$. An edge e of $[n] \times G$ is called an *essential* edge if all weight minimizing paths pass through the edge e . Let $L_n(G)$ denote the number of essential edges given the edge weights ω . Clearly $L_n(G)$ is a random variable. Lemma 5.4 gives upper bound for the p -th central moment of $t_n(G)$ in terms of moments of $L_n(G)$. Roughly it says that the fluctuation of $t_n(G)$ around its mean behaves like square root of $L_n(G)$.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for some $p \geq 2$ where $\omega \sim F$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|t_n(G) - \mathbb{E}[t_n(G)]|^p] &\leq (2p)^{p/2} \mathbb{E}[L_n(G)^{p/2}] \mathbb{E}[\omega^2]^{p/2} \\ &\quad + 2^{p/2} (2p)^{p-2} \mathbb{E}[L_n(G)] \mathbb{E}[\omega^p] \end{aligned}$$

where $L_n(G)$ is the number of essential edges for $t_n(G)$.

Proof. The proof essentially is a general version of the Efron-Stein inequality. Fix n, G and a fixed enumeration $\{e_1, \dots, e_N\}$ of the edges in $[n] \times G$ where N is the number of edges in that graph. Consider the random variable $t_n(G) - \mathbb{E}[t_n(G)]$ as a function $f(\omega)$ of the edge weight configuration $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ where ω_i is the weight of the edge e_i .

Let $\omega'_1, \dots, \omega'_N$ be i.i.d. copies of ω_1 . For a subset S of $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ define $\omega^S \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ as the configuration where $(\omega^S)_i = \omega_i$ for $i \notin S$ and $(\omega^S)_i = \omega'_i$ for $i \in S$. Recall that $[i]$ denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, i\}$. Clearly $\omega^{[0]} = \omega$.

For illustration we will prove the $p = 2$ case first which is the Efron-Stein inequality. Recall that $\mathbb{E}[f(\omega)] = 0$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\omega)^2] = \mathbb{E}[f(\omega)(f(\omega) - f(\omega^{[N]}))] = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[f(\omega)(f(\omega^{[i-1]}) - f(\omega^{[i]}))].$$

Exchanging ω_i, ω'_i one can easily see that $(\omega^{\{i\}}, \omega^{[i]}, \omega^{[i-1]}) \stackrel{d}{=} (\omega, \omega^{[i-1]}, \omega^{[i]})$ and hence we have

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\omega)^2] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[(f(\omega) - f(\omega^{\{i\}}))(f(\omega^{[i-1]}) - f(\omega^{[i]}))].$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and exchangeability of ω_i, ω'_i we see that

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\omega)^2] \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[(f(\omega) - f(\omega^{\{i\}}))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega'_i > \omega_i\}}].$$

Now note that $\omega'_i > \omega_i$ and $f(\omega) \neq f(\omega^{\{i\}})$ implies that the i -th edge e_i is essential for the configuration ω and moreover, $0 < f(\omega^{\{i\}}) - f(\omega) \leq \omega'_i - \omega_i \leq \omega'_i$. Also ω'_i is independent of ω . Thus we have

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\omega)^2] \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[(\omega'_i)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{e_i \text{ is essential for } \omega\}}] = \mathbb{E}[\omega_i^2] \mathbb{E}[L_n]$$

where L_n is the number of essential edges for the configuration ω .

Let $g(\cdot)$ be the function $g(x) = x|x|^{p-2}$. Using similar decomposition as was done for $p = 2$ case we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|f(\omega)|^p] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[(f(\omega) - f(\omega^{\{i\}}))(g(\omega^{[i-1]}) - g(\omega^{[i]}))].$$

Now Lemma 5.2 and symmetry of ω_i and ω'_i imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|f(\omega)|^p] &\leq a_p \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[|f(\omega) - f(\omega^{\{i\}})| |f(\omega^{[i-1]}) - f(\omega^{[i]})| \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \left(|f(\omega^{[i-1]})|^{p-2} + |f(\omega^{[i]})|^{p-2} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{\omega'_i > \omega_i\}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

where $a_p = \max\{1, (p-1)/2\}$. Note that $\omega'_i > \omega_i$, $f(\omega^{\{i\}}) \neq f(\omega)$ and $f(\omega^{[i]}) \neq f(\omega^{[i-1]})$ imply that $0 < f(\omega^{\{i\}}) - f(\omega), f(\omega^{[i]}) - f(\omega^{[i-1]}) \leq \omega'_i$ and the edge e_i is essential for both the configurations ω and $\omega^{[i-1]}$. Moreover in that case we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(\omega^{[i]})|^{p-2} &\leq |f(\omega^{[i-1]})| + \omega'_i{}^{p-2} \\ &\leq 3|f(\omega^{[i-1]})|^{p-2} + \max\{2, (2(p-3))^{p-3}\}(\omega'_i)^{p-2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last line follows easily when $p \leq 3$. For $p > 3$ the last line follows by taking $\varepsilon = e^{-1/(p-3)}$, using Jensen's inequality $(a+b)^{p-2} \leq \varepsilon^{3-p} x^{p-2} + (1-\varepsilon)^{3-p} y^{p-2}$ and $(1-\varepsilon)^{-1} \leq \max\{2, 2(p-3)\}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|f(\omega)|^p] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[(\omega'_i)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{e_i \text{ is essential for } \omega^{[i-1]}\}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \left(4a_p |f(\omega^{[i-1]})|^{p-2} + b_p (\omega'_i)^{p-2} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where $b_p = a_p \max\{2, (2(p-3))^{p-3}\}$. Simplifying we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|f(\omega)|^p] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[(\omega'_i)^2 \mathbf{1}\{e_i \text{ is essential for } \omega\} (4a_p |f(\omega)|^{p-2} + b_p (\omega'_i)^{p-2})] \\ &= 4a_p \mathbb{E}[(\omega'_i)^2] \mathbb{E}[L_n |f(\omega)|^{p-2}] + b_p \mathbb{E}[(\omega'_i)^p] \mathbb{E}[L_n] \end{aligned}$$

where L_n is the number of essential edges in the configuration ω . Let $y = \mathbb{E}[|f(\omega)|^p]^{(p-2)/p}$. Using Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} y^{p/(p-2)} &= \mathbb{E}[|f(\omega)|^p] \\ &\leq 4a_p \mathbb{E}[\omega^2] \mathbb{E}[L_n^{p/2}]^{2/p} \mathbb{E}[|f(\omega)|^p]^{(p-2)/p} + b_p \mathbb{E}[\omega^p] \mathbb{E}[L_n] \\ &= 4a_p \mathbb{E}[L_n^{p/2}]^{2/p} \mathbb{E}[\omega^2] y + b_p \mathbb{E}[L_n] \mathbb{E}[\omega^p]. \end{aligned}$$

Now Lemma 5.3 with $\beta = p/(p-2)$ gives that

$$\mathbb{E}[|f(\omega)|^p]^{2/p} = y^{\beta-1} \leq 4a_p \mathbb{E}[L_n^{p/2}]^{2/p} \mathbb{E}[\omega^2] + (b_p \mathbb{E}[L_n] \mathbb{E}[\omega^p])^{2/p}$$

or

$$\mathbb{E}[|f(\omega)|^p] \leq 2^{p/2-1} (2a_p)^{p/2} \mathbb{E}[L_n^{p/2}] \mathbb{E}[\omega^2]^{p/2} + 2^{p/2-1} b_p \mathbb{E}[L_n] \mathbb{E}[\omega^p].$$

Note that $2a_p \leq p$ and $b_p \leq 2^{p-1} p^{p-2}$. Hence simplifying we finally conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}[|f(\omega)|^p] \leq (2p)^{p/2} \mathbb{E}[L_n^{p/2}] \mathbb{E}[\omega^2]^{p/2} + 2^{p/2} (2p)^{p-2} \mathbb{E}[L_n] \mathbb{E}[\omega^p].$$

Now we are done. $\square$

It is easy to see that $L_n(G)$ is smaller than the length of any length minimizing path. In fact the random variable $L_n(G)$ grows linearly with n . The following well-known result due to Kesten [16] will be useful to get an upper bound on the length of a weight minimizing path.

Lemma 5.5 (Proposition 5.8 in Kesten [16]). *If $F(0) < p_c(d)$ then there exist constants $0 < a, b, c < \infty$ depending on d and F only, such that the probability that there exists a selfavoiding path $\mathcal{P}$ from the origin which contains at least n many edges but has $\omega(\mathcal{P}) < cn$ is smaller than ae^{-bn} .*

Combining Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5 we have the proof of Proposition 5.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Note that $G_n = G$ for all n clearly implies that $L_n(G) \leq 3nk$ where $k = k(G)$ is the number of edges in G . This completes the proof for the case where the constants depend on G .

Let π_n be the minimum number of edges in a weight minimizing path for $t_n(G_n)$. To complete the proof it is enough to show the following: if G_n 's are subgraphs of $\mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$ and $F(0) < p_c(d)$ we have $\mathbb{E}[\pi_n^{p/2}] \leq cn^{p/2}$ for some

constant c depending only on d, p and F . We follow the idea from [17]. We have

$$\mathbb{P}(\pi_n > tn) \leq \mathbb{P}(t_n(G_n) > ctn) + \mathbb{P}(\text{there exists a self avoiding path } \mathcal{P} \text{ starting from } 0 \text{ of at least } tn \text{ edges but with } \omega(\mathcal{P}) < ctn).$$

Now using Lemma 5.5 we see that the second probability decays like ae^{-btn} . And the first probability is bounded by $\mathbb{P}(S_n > ctn)$ where S_n is the weight of the straight line path joining $(0, o)$ to (n, o) . Clearly S_n is sum of n many i.i.d. random variables. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\pi_n^{p/2}] &= \int_0^\infty \frac{n^{p/2}p}{2} t^{p/2-1} \mathbb{P}(\pi_n > tn) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \frac{n^{p/2}p}{2} t^{p/2-1} \mathbb{P}(S_n > ctn) dt + \int_0^\infty \frac{n^{p/2}p}{2} t^{p/2-1} ae^{-btn} dt \\ &= c^{-p/2} \mathbb{E}[S_n^{p/2}] + \frac{ap}{2b^{p/2}} \text{Gamma}(p/2) \leq c_1 n^{p/2} \end{aligned}$$

where the constant c_1 depends on d, p and F . The result for $a_n(G)$ and $T_n(G)$ follow by Lemma 3.1 that

$$\mathbb{E}[|t_n(G) - a_n(G)|^p] \leq \mathbb{E}[|t_n(G) - T_n(G)|^p] \leq \mathbb{E}[(2D\omega)^p]$$

for all n, G when $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for some $p \geq 2$ with $\omega \sim F$ and D is the diameter of G . $\square$

Proof of the first technical Lemma 5.2. For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}/\{0\}, x \neq y$, let $z = x/y$. Then we have

$$\frac{x|x|^{p-2} - y|y|^{p-2}}{(x-y)(|x|^{p-2} + |y|^{p-2})} = \frac{z|z|^{p-2} - 1}{(z-1)(|z|^{p-2} + 1)}.$$

Now, the lemma follows from the fact that

$$c_p := \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{z|z|^{p-2} - 1}{(z-1)(|z|^{p-2} + 1)} \right| \leq \max\{1, (p-1)/2\}.$$

To prove this note that, by $p > 2$ we have

$$\sup_{z \geq 0} \frac{z^{p-1} + 1}{(z+1)(z^{p-2} + 1)} \leq 1$$

and

$$\sup_{z \geq 0} \frac{z^{p-1} - 1}{(z-1)(z^{p-2} + 1)} = \left(1 - \sup_{x \geq 0} \frac{\sinh \frac{p-3}{p-1} x}{\sinh x} \right)^{-1} = \begin{cases} \left(1 - \frac{p-3}{p-1} \right)^{-1} & \text{if } p > 3, \\ (1-0)^{-1} & \text{if } p \leq 3 \end{cases}$$

and the line can be written succinctly as $\max\{1, (p-1)/2\}$. $\square$

Proof of the second technical Lemma 5.3. Define $f(a, b) := (b + a^{1-1/\beta})^{1/(\beta-1)}$ and $g(a, b) := \sup\{y \geq 0 : y^\beta \leq a + by\}$. Without loss of generality assume $b > 0$. Then it is easy to see that

$$g(a, b) = b^{1/(\beta-1)} g(ab^{-\beta/(\beta-1)}, 1) \text{ and } f(a, b) = b^{1/(\beta-1)} f(ab^{-\beta/(\beta-1)}, 1).$$

So again w.l.g. we can assume that $b = 1$. Clearly $f(a, 1) \geq 1, g(a, 1) \geq 1$.

Let $F : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the strictly increasing function $F(x) := x^\beta - x$. Note that $F(g(a, 1)) = a$. Now $y > f(a, 1)$ implies that $y^\beta - y = F(y) > F(f(a, 1)) = f(a, 1)(f(a, 1)^{\beta-1} - 1) \geq a^{1/\beta}(1 + a^{(\beta-1)/\beta} - 1) = a$. Hence the upper bound is proved. $\square$

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

The proof of Theorem 2.1 will be given in several steps. First we will show that it is enough to prove the CLT for $T_n(G_n)$ after proper centering and scaling. Then we will prove that $T_n(G_n)$ is “approximately” a sum of i.i.d. random variables each having distribution $T_l(G_n)$ and an error term where l depends on n . Finally, using successive breaking of $T_l(G_n)$ into i.i.d. sums (the ‘renormalization steps’) and controlling the error in each step, we will complete the proof. Recall that the notations $a_n = O(b_n)$ and $a_n = o(b_n)$, respectively, mean that $a_n \leq Cb_n$ for all $n \geq 1$ for some constant $C < \infty$ and $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Throughout the proof c will denote a constant that depends only on q, F and whose value may change from line to line.

6.1. Reduction to $T_n(G_n)$. Let us first recall the setting. We have a sequence of nondecreasing graphs G_n with G_n having diameter d_n and k_n edges. We also have $k_n = O(d_n^\theta)$ for some fixed $\theta \geq 1$. Define

$$\mu_n(G) := \mathbb{E}[T_n(G)] \text{ and } \sigma_n^2(G) := \text{Var}(T_n(G))$$

for any integer $n \geq 1$ and any finite connected graph G .

Now from Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|a_n(G_n) - T_n(G_n)|^p] \leq 2^p d_n^p \mathbb{E}[\omega^p]$$

for all n when $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for a typical edge weight ω . Moreover, from Proposition 2.2 we have $\sigma_n^2(G_n) \geq cnk_n^{-1}$ for all n for some absolute constant $c > 0$ when $d_n = o(n)$. Thus when $d_n^2 = o(nk_n^{-1})$ (which is satisfied if $d_n = o(n^{1/(2+\theta)})$), we have

$$\frac{T_n(G_n) - \mu_n(G_n)}{\sigma_n(G_n)} - \frac{a_n(G_n) - \mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)]}{\text{Var}(a_n(G_n))^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{L^2} 0.$$

Hence it is enough to prove CLT for $(T_n(G_n) - \mu_n(G_n))/\sigma_n(G_n)$ when $d_n = o(n^{1/(2+\theta)})$. From now on we will assume that

$$d_n = o(n^\alpha) \text{ with } \alpha < 1/(2 + \theta) \text{ fixed.}$$

6.2. Approximation as an i.i.d. sum. In Lemma 6.1 we will prove a relation between side-to-side first-passage times in large and small cylinders and this will be crucial to the whole analysis. Fix an integer n and a finite connected graph G . Let $n = ml + r$ with $0 \leq r < l$ where $l \geq 1$ is an integer.

We divide the cylinder graph $[n] \times G$ horizontally into m equal-sized smaller cylinder graphs $R_1, \dots, R_m$ with $R_i = [(i-1)l, il] \times G, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ each having width l and a residual graph $R_{m+1} = [ml, n] \times G$. Let

$$X_i = T_{(i-1)l, il}(G) \quad (6.1)$$

be the side-to-side first-passage time for the product graph R_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ (see Definition 2.1). We also define $X_{m+1} = T_{ml, n}(G)$ for the residual graph R_{m+1} . Clearly $X_{m+1} = 0$ if $r = 0$. Note that X_i 's depend on n and G , but we will suppress n, G for readability. We have the following relation. This is a generalization of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 6.1. *Let n, G be fixed. Let X_i be as defined in (6.1). Then the random variable*

$$Y := T_n(G) - (X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_{m+1})$$

is nonnegative and is stochastically dominated by S_{mD} where S_{mD} is sum of mD many i.i.d. random variables each having distribution F and D is the diameter of G . Moreover, $X_1, \dots, X_m$ are i.i.d. having the same distribution as $T_l(G)$, X_{m+1} has the distribution of $T_r(G)$ and X_{m+1} is independent of $X_1, \dots, X_m$.

Proof. First of all, it is easy to see that X_i depends only on the weights for the edge set $\{e : e \text{ is an edge in } [(i-1)l, il] \times G\} \setminus \{e \mid e \text{ is an edge in } \{(i-1)l\} \times G \text{ or } \{il\} \times G\}$. Thus, $X_1, \dots, X_m$'s are i.i.d. having the same distribution as $T_l(G)$.

Now choose a minimal weight path $\mathcal{P}^*$ joining the left boundary $\{0\} \times G$ to the right boundary $\{n\} \times G$ (if there are more than one path one can use some deterministic rule to break the tie). The path $\mathcal{P}^*$ hits all the boundaries $\{il\} \times G$ at some vertex for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$. Let $u_i, v_i, i = 0, 1, \dots, m$ be the vertices in G such that for each i , $\mathcal{P}^*$ hits $\{il\} \times G$ for the last time at the vertex (il, u_i) and after that it hits the boundary $\{(i+1)l\} \times G$ at the vertex $((i+1)l, v_i)$ for the first time (take $(m+1)l$ to be n). Clearly if $\mathcal{P}^*$ hits $\{il\} \times G$ only at a single vertex then $u_i = v_{i-1}$. Now the part of $\mathcal{P}^*$ between the vertices (il, u_i) and $((i+1)l, v_i)$ is a path in $[il, (i+1)l] \times G$ and hence has weight more than X_i . But all these parts are disjoint. Hence we have $T_n(G) = \omega(\mathcal{P}^*) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} X_i$.

Now to prove upper bound for Y , let $\mathcal{P}_i^*$ be a minimal weight path joining the left boundary $\{il\} \times G$ to the right boundary $\{(i+1)l\} \times G$ and achieving the weight X_i . Suppose $\mathcal{P}_i^*$ hits $\{il\} \times G$ at (il, w_i) and hits $\{(i+1)l\} \times G$ at $((i+1)l, z_i)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$. Let $\mathcal{P}_i$ be a minimal length path in $\{il\} \times G$ joining (il, z_{i-1}) to (il, w_i) for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Consider the concatenated path $\mathcal{P}_0^*, \mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_1^*, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_m^*$ joining $(0, w_0)$ to (n, z_{m+1}) . By minimality of

weight we have

$$T_n(G) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m (X_i + \omega(\mathcal{P}_i)) + X_{m+1}.$$

Thus we have $Y = T_n(G) - \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} X_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \omega(\mathcal{P}_i)$. Clearly $\sum_{i=1}^m \omega(\mathcal{P}_i)$ is a sum of $\sum_{i=1}^m d(z_{i-1}, w_i)$ many i.i.d. random variables each having distribution F where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the graph distance in G_n . But we have $\sum_{i=1}^m d(z_{i-1}, w_i) \leq mD$ by definition of the diameter. Now F is supported on $\mathbb{R}^+$. Thus we are done. $\square$

An obvious corollary of Lemma 6.1 is the following.

Corollary 6.2. *For any integer m, l, r and connected graph G we have*

$$|\mu_{ml+r}(G) - (m\mu_l(G) + \mu_r(G))| \leq mD\mu$$

and

$$\left| \sigma_{ml+r}(G) - (m\sigma_l^2(G) + \sigma_r^2(G))^{1/2} \right| \leq mD(\mu^2 + \sigma^2)^{1/2}$$

where D is the diameter of G .

Proof. Taking expectation of Y in Lemma 6.1 with $n = ml + r$ we have $\mathbb{E}[Y] = \mu_n(G) - m\mu_l(G) - \mu_r(G)$ and $0 \leq \mathbb{E}[Y] \leq mD\mu$.

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \text{Var}(T_n(G))^{1/2} - \text{Var}(T_n(G) - Y)^{1/2} \right| \\ &= \left| \|T_n(G) - \mathbb{E}[T_n(G)]\|_2 - \|T_n(G) - Y - \mathbb{E}[T_n(G) - Y]\|_2 \right| \\ &\leq \|Y - \mathbb{E}[Y]\|_2 \leq (\mathbb{E}[Y^2])^{1/2} \leq mD(\mu^2 + \sigma^2)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the result follows since $T_n(G) - Y = \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} X_i$ and X_i 's are independent of each other. $\square$

6.3. Lyapounov condition. From here onwards, we return to using n in subscripts and superscripts. From Lemma 6.1 and Corollary 6.2 clearly we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} |T_n(G_n) - \mu_n(G_n) - (X_1^{(n)} + X_2^{(n)} + \cdots + X_m^{(n)} - m\mu_l(G_n))| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} |T_n(G_n) - (X_1^{(n)} + X_2^{(n)} + \cdots + X_{m+1}^{(n)})| + md_n\mu + \mathbb{E} |X_{m+1}^{(n)} - \mu_r(G_n)| \\ &\leq 2md_n\mu + \sigma_r(G_n) \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

where $X_i^{(n)}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ are defined as in (6.1) and $n = ml + r$. We will take

$$l = \max\{\lfloor n^\beta \rfloor, 1\} \text{ for some fixed } \beta \in (2/(2 + \theta), 1) \text{ and } m = \lfloor n/l \rfloor.$$

Then we have $d_n^2 = o(l)$ and all the lower and upper bounds on moments are valid for $T_l(G_n)$. The dependence of m, l on n is kept implicit. Note

that $0 \leq r < l$. Moreover, writing $l - r$ in place of l and 1 in place of m , we get from Corollary 6.2 that

$$\sigma_r(G_n) \leq \sigma_l(G_n) + (\mu^2 + \sigma^2)^{1/2} d_n. \quad (6.3)$$

Thus from (6.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{T_n(G_n) - \mu_n(G_n)}{\sqrt{m}\sigma_l(G_n)} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (X_i^{(n)} - \mu_l(G_n))}{\sqrt{m}\sigma_l(G_n)} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{2md_n\mu + \sigma_r(G_n)}{\sqrt{m}\sigma_l(G_n)} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} + 3(\sigma^2 + \mu^2)^{1/2} \frac{\sqrt{m}d_n}{\sigma_l(G_n)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

Recall that we have $l \sim n^\beta$ for some $\beta < 1$ and thus $m \sim n^{1-\beta}$. From the lower bound for the variance in Proposition 2.2 (as $d_n = o(l)$) we have

$$\frac{md_n^2}{\sigma_l^2(G_n)} \leq \frac{cm^2d_n^2k_n}{n},$$

where c is some absolute constant. By our assumption on m, d_n and k_n we have $m^2d_n^2k_n = o(n)$ when $\alpha \leq (2\beta - 1)/(2 + \theta)$ which is true for some $\beta < 1$ as $\alpha < 1/(2 + \theta)$. Hence $(T_n(G_n) - \mu_n(G_n))/\sqrt{m}\sigma_l(G_n)$ has the same asymptotic limit as

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m X_i^{(n)} - m\mu_l(G_n)}{\sqrt{m}\sigma_l(G_n)} \quad (6.5)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ when

$$\alpha \leq \frac{2\beta - 1}{2 + \theta} \text{ for some } \beta \in \left(\frac{2}{2 + \theta}, 1 \right). \quad (6.6)$$

Now $X_i^{(n)}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ are i.i.d. random variables with finite second moment, hence by the CLT for triangular arrays it is expected that (6.5) has standard Gaussian distribution asymptotically. However we cannot expect CLT for all values of β .

Let $s_n^2 := m\sigma_l^2(G_n)$ be the variance of $\sum_{i=1}^m X_i^{(n)}$. To use Lindeberg condition for triangular arrays of i.i.d. random variables we need to show that

$$\frac{m}{s_n^2} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_l^2 \mathbb{1}\{|\tilde{T}_l| \geq \varepsilon s_n\}] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$ where $\tilde{T}_l = T_l(G_n) - \mu_l(G_n)$. However, any bound using the relation $T_l(G_n) \leq S_l$ where S_l is the weight of the straight line path joining $(0, o)$ and (l, o) , gives rise to the condition $\theta\alpha \leq 1 - 2\beta$. The last condition is contradictory to (6.6). The difficulty arises from the fact that the lower and upper bounds for the variances are not tight.

Still we can prove a CLT by using estimates for the moments of $\tilde{T}_l(G_n)$ from Proposition 5.1 and using a blocking technique which is reminiscent of

the renormalization group method. Note that Lindeberg condition follows from the Lyapounov condition

$$\frac{m}{s_n^p} \mathbb{E}[|T_l(G_n) - \mu_l(G_n)|^p] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for some } p > 2 \quad (6.7)$$

and thus it is enough to prove (6.7) for some $\beta \in (2/(2 + \theta), 1)$ where $l = \max\{\lfloor n^\beta \rfloor, 1\}$, $m = \lfloor n/l \rfloor$, $s_n^2 = m\sigma_l^2(G_n)$. We also need to satisfy (6.6) to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1.

6.4. A technical estimate. We need the following technical estimate for the next “renormalization” step. The lemma gives an upper bound on the moment of sums of i.i.d. random variables.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $Y_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ be i.i.d. random variables with mean zero and variance σ_Y^2 . Assume that $\mathbb{E}[Y_i^{2q}] < \infty$ for some integer $q > 1$. Define $S_m = Y_1 + Y_2 + \dots + Y_m$. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[S_m^{2q}] \leq A_q m^q \mathbb{E}[Y^2]^q + B_q m \mathbb{E}[Y^{2q}] \quad (6.8)$$

where A_q and B_q are constants depending only on q .

Proof. Let $Y \stackrel{d}{=} Y_1$. For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2q}) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{2q}$, we will denote $\sum_{i=1}^{2q} a_i$ by $|\mathbf{a}|$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{2q} i a_i$ by $z(\mathbf{a})$. To estimate $\mathbb{E}[S_m^{2q}]$, we will use the following decomposition which is an easy exercise in combinatorics. We have

$$\mathbb{E}[S_m^{2q}] = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{2q}: z(\mathbf{a})=2q} \frac{(2q)!}{\prod_{i=1}^{2q} i!^{a_i} a_i!} (m)_{|\mathbf{a}|} \prod_{i=1}^{2q} \mathbb{E}[Y^i]^{a_i}$$

where $(m)_k := m!/(m-k)! \leq m^k$. Note that here we used the fact that Y_i 's are i.i.d.. Since $\mathbb{E}[Y] = 0$ we can and we will assume that $a_1 = 0$. Thus using Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_m^{2q}] &\leq \sum_{z(\mathbf{a})=2q} \frac{(2q)!}{\prod_{i=2}^{2q} i!^{a_i} a_i!} (m)_{|\mathbf{a}|} \prod_{i=2}^{2q} \mathbb{E}[|Y|^i]^{a_i} \\ &\leq \sum_{z(\mathbf{a})=2q} \frac{(2q)!}{\prod_{i=2}^{2q} i!^{a_i} a_i!} m^{|\mathbf{a}|} \prod_{i=2}^{2q} \mathbb{E}[Y^2]^{\frac{a_i(q-i/2)}{q-1}} \mathbb{E}[Y^{2q}]^{\frac{a_i(i/2-1)}{q-1}} \\ &\leq \sum_{z(\mathbf{a})=2q} \frac{(2q)!}{\prod_{i=2}^{2q} i!^{a_i} a_i!} (m^q \mathbb{E}[Y^2]^q)^{\frac{|\mathbf{a}|-1}{q-1}} (m \mathbb{E}[Y^{2q}])^{\frac{q-|\mathbf{a}|}{q-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $2|\mathbf{a}| \leq z(\mathbf{a}) = 2q$ as $a_1 = 0$. Now using the fact that $x^\alpha y^{1-\alpha} \leq \alpha x + (1-\alpha)y$ for all $x, y \geq 0, \alpha \in [0, 1]$ we finally have

$$\mathbb{E}[S_m^{2q}] \leq A_q m^q \mathbb{E}[Y^2]^q + B_q m \mathbb{E}[Y^{2q}] \quad (6.9)$$

where

$$A_q := \sum_{z(\mathbf{a})=2q} \frac{(|\mathbf{a}|-1)(2q)!}{(q-1) \prod_{i=2}^{2q} i!^{a_i} a_i!} \text{ and } B_q := \sum_{z(\mathbf{a})=2q} \frac{(q-|\mathbf{a}|)(2q)!}{(q-1) \prod_{i=2}^{2q} i!^{a_i} a_i!}$$

are constants depending only on q . $\square$

6.5. Renormalization Step. Now we are ready to start our proof of the Lyapounov condition. For simplicity we will write $T_l(G) - \mu_l(G)$ imply as $\tilde{T}_l(G)$. Recall that

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[T_n(G_n)]}{n}.$$

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose that $\nu > 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for some $p > 2$ where ω is a typical edge weight. Suppose either $G_n = G$ for all n or G_n 's are subgraphs of $\mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$. Let $l = \max\{\lfloor n^\beta \rfloor, 1\}$, $d_n = o(n^\alpha)$ with $2\alpha < \beta$ and $k_n = O(d_n^\theta)$ for fixed $\theta \geq 1$. Suppose that either*

$$\alpha \leq \frac{p-2}{p} \cdot \frac{1-\beta}{\theta}$$

or there exist $t \geq 2$ real numbers $\beta_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ such that $2\alpha < \beta_t < \beta_{t-1} < \dots < \beta_1 = \beta$ and we have

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1 - 2(\beta_i - \beta_{i+1}) - (1 - \beta_i)/q}{2 + \theta} \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, t-1,$$

$$\text{and } \alpha \leq \frac{q-1}{q} \cdot \frac{1-\beta_t}{\theta}$$

where $q = \lfloor p/2 \rfloor$. Then we have

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m X_i^{(n)} - m\mu_l(G_n)}{\sqrt{m\sigma_l(G_n)}} \implies N(0, 1)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ where $X_i^{(n)}$'s are i.i.d. with $X_i^{(n)} \stackrel{d}{=} T_l(G_n)$.

Proof. Since $X_i^{(n)}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ are i.i.d. with mean $\mu_l(G_n)$ and variance $\sigma_l^2(G_n)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for some $p > 2$, we can use the Lyapounov condition to prove the central limit theorem. We need to show that

$$\frac{m}{s_n^p} \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{T}_l(G_n)|^p] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

where $s_n^2 = m\sigma_l^2(G_n)$. By the variance lower bound from Proposition 2.2 we have

$$s_n^2 \geq c_1 \frac{ml}{k_n} \geq c_2 \frac{n}{k_n} \quad (6.10)$$

for some constants $c_i > 0$ where k_n is the number of edges in G_n . Using the moment bound from Proposition 5.1 and lower bound on s_n^2 (note that $d_n^2 = o(l)$) we have

$$\frac{m}{s_n^p} \mathbb{E}[|\tilde{T}_l(G_n)|^p] \leq \frac{c_p m l^{p/2}}{(n/k_n)^{p/2}} \leq \frac{c_p m l^{p/2} k_n^{p/2}}{(ml)^{p/2}} = \frac{c_p k_n^{p/2}}{m^{(p-2)/2}}.$$

Thus when $k_n = o(m^{1-2/p})$ or equivalently $\theta\alpha \leq (1-2/p)(1-\beta)$, we see that the right hand side converges to zero and we have a central limit theorem. This proves the first assertion of the theorem, i.e. the case of $p < 4$.

Let us now consider the case $p \geq 4$. Now, the random variable $T_l(G_n)$ itself behaves like a sum of i.i.d. random variables each having distribution $T_{l'}(G_n)$ for $l' < l$. We will use this fact to improve the required growth rate of k_n . Let $q = \lfloor p/2 \rfloor$ and assume that there exist $t \geq 2$ real numbers $\beta_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ such that $2\alpha < \beta_t < \beta_{t-1} < \dots < \beta_1 = \beta$ and we have

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1 - 2(\beta_i - \beta_{i+1}) - (1 - \beta_i)/q}{2 + \theta} \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, t-1$$

$$\text{and } \alpha \leq \frac{q-1}{q} \cdot \frac{1 - \beta_t}{\theta}. \quad (6.11)$$

From now on we will write l_1, m_1 and β_1 instead of l, m and β respectively. Recall that we have $l_1 = \max\{\lfloor n^{\beta_1} \rfloor, 1\}$ and $d_n = o(n^\alpha)$. We will take

$$l_i = \max\{\lfloor n^{\beta_i} \rfloor, 1\}, m_i = \lfloor l_{i-1}/l_i \rfloor \text{ for } i = 2, \dots, t.$$

The idea is as follows. First we will break the cylinder graph $[0, l_1] \times G_n$ into m_2 many equal sized graphs each of which looks like $[0, l_2] \times G_n$. Then we will break each of the new graphs again into m_3 many equal sized graphs each of which looks like $[0, l_3] \times G_n$ and so on. We will stop after t steps. Our goal is to break the error term into smaller and smaller quantities and show that the original quantity is “small” when each of the final quantities are “small”. Throughout the proof $q, t, \theta, \alpha, \beta_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ are fixed.

For simplicity, first we will assume that

$$l_1 = m_2 m_3 \dots m_t l_t.$$

Under this assumption we have $m_i l_i = l_{i-1}$ for all $i = 2, \dots, t$. Otherwise one has to look at the error terms which can be easily bounded using essentially the same idea and are considered in (6.19).

First Step. Let us start with the first splitting. We break the rectangular graph $[0, l_1] \times G_n$ into m_2 many equal sized graphs $[(i-1)l_2, il_2] \times G_n$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m_2$. Recall that we have $l_1 = m_2 l_2$.

Let $S_{m_2} = \sum_{i=1}^{m_2} X_i$ where $X_i = T_{(i-1)l_2, il_2}(G_n) - \mu_{l_2}(G_n)$. Recall that X_i 's are i.i.d. having the same distribution as $\tilde{T}_{l_2}(G_n)$ where $\tilde{T}_l(G_n) = T_l(G_n) - \mu_l(G_n)$. Let $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(n) := m_1/s_n^{2q}$. We need to show the Lyapounov condition:

$$\varepsilon_1 \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{l_1}(G_n)^{2q}] = o(1). \quad (6.12)$$

From Lemma 6.1 we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{T}_{l_1}(G_n) - S_{m_2}|^{2q}] \leq c(m_2 d_n)^{2q} \mathbb{E}[\omega^{2q}]$$

for some constant $c > 0$. Moreover, Lemma 6.3 implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{m_2}^{2q}] \leq A_q m_2^q \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{l_2}(G_n)^2]^q + B_q m_2 \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{l_2}(G_n)^{2q}].$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_1 \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{l_1}(G_n)^{2q}] \\ \leq c(\varepsilon_1(m_2 d_n)^{2q} + \varepsilon_1 m_2^q \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{l_2}(G_n)^2]^q + \varepsilon_1 m_2 \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{l_2}(G_n)^{2q}]). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we need to show that

$$\varepsilon_1(m_2 d_n)^{2q} = o(1), \quad (6.13)$$

$$\varepsilon_1 m_2^q \sigma_{l_2}^{2q}(G_n) = o(1) \quad (6.14)$$

$$\text{and } \varepsilon_1 m_2 \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{l_2}(G_n)^{2q}] = o(1) \quad (6.15)$$

Using the variance lower bound (6.10) we have

$$\varepsilon_1(m_2 d_n)^{2q} \leq c \frac{m_1(m_2)^{2q}(d_n^2 k_n)^q}{n^q} \leq c \left(\frac{d_n^2 k_n}{n^{1-2(\beta_1-\beta_2)-(1-\beta_1)/q}} \right)^q.$$

Now (6.13) follows as $d_n^2 k_n = o(n^{(2+\theta)\alpha})$ and $(2+\theta)\alpha \leq 1 - 2(\beta_1 - \beta_2) - (1 - \beta_1)/q$. Moreover, Corollary 6.2 with $l_1 = m_2 l_2$ implies that

$$(m_2 \sigma_{l_2}^2(G_n))^{1/2} \leq \sigma_{l_1}(G_n) + c m_2 d_n.$$

Thus using the definition of $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(n)$ and the fact that $s_n^2 = m_1 \sigma_{l_1}^2(G_n)$ we have

$$\varepsilon_1 m_2^q \sigma_{l_2}^{2q}(G_n) \leq c(\varepsilon_1 \sigma_{l_1}^{2q}(G_n) + \varepsilon_1(m_2 d_n)^{2q}) \leq c \left(m_1^{1-q} + \varepsilon_1(m_2 d_n)^{2q} \right)$$

and the right hand side is $o(1)$ as $q > 1$ and by (6.13). So the only thing that remains to be proved is that

$$\varepsilon_1 m_2 \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{l_2}(G_n)^{2q}] = o(1).$$

Induction step. From the above calculations in step 1 the induction step is clear. Define

$$\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_i(n) = \frac{m_1 m_2 \cdots m_i}{s_n^{2q}} \text{ for } i \geq 1.$$

Claim 1. We have $\varepsilon_i(m_{i+1} d_n)^{2q} = o(1)$ for all $i < t$.

Proof of Claim 1. Fix any i . Using definition of ε_i and the variance lower bound from (6.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_i(m_{i+1} d_n)^{2q} &= \frac{m_1 \cdots m_i (m_{i+1} d_n)^{2q}}{s_n^{2q}} \leq c \frac{n^{1-\beta_i} m_{i+1}^{2q} (d_n^2 k_n)^q}{n^q} \\ &= o \left(\left[\frac{n^{(2+\theta)\alpha}}{n^{1-2(\beta_i-\beta_{i+1})-(1-\beta_i)/q}} \right]^q \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now the claim follows by our assumption (6.11) that $(2+\theta)\alpha \leq 1 - 2(\beta_i - \beta_{i+1}) - (1 - \beta_i)/q$ for all $i < t$.

Our next claim is the following.

Claim 2. We have $\varepsilon_i m_{i+1}^q \sigma_{l_{i+1}}^{2q}(G_n) = o(1)$ for all $i \geq 1$.

Proof of Claim 2. We will prove the claim by induction on i . We have

already proved the claim for $i = 1$ in (6.14). Now suppose that the claim is true for some $i \geq 1$. Using Corollary 6.2 for $l_{i+1} = l_{i+2}m_{i+2}$ we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{i+1}(m_{i+2}\sigma_{l_{i+2}}^2(G_n))^q &\leq c(\varepsilon_{i+1}\sigma_{l_{i+1}}^{2q}(G_n) + \varepsilon_{i+1}(m_{i+2}d_n)^{2q}) \\ &= c(\varepsilon_i m_{i+1}\sigma_{l_{i+1}}^{2q}(G_n) + \varepsilon_{i+1}(m_{i+2}d_n)^{2q}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $\varepsilon_{i+1}(m_{i+2}\sigma_{l_{i+2}}^2(G_n))^q = o(1)$ by Claim 1 and the induction hypothesis as $q > 1$. This completes the proof.

Claim 3. For any $i \geq 1$, $\varepsilon_i \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_i(G_n)^{2q}] = o(1)$ if $\varepsilon_{i+1} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{l_{i+1}}(G_n)^{2q}] = o(1)$.

Proof of Claim 3. Assume that $\varepsilon_{i+1} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{l_{i+1}}(G_n)^{2q}] = o(1)$. We write $\tilde{T}_i(G_n)$ as a sum of $S_{m_{i+1}}$ and an error term of order $m_{i+1}d_n$ where $S_{m_{i+1}}$ is sum of m_{i+1} many i.i.d. random variables each having distribution $\tilde{T}_{l_{i+1}}(G_n)$. Using Lemma 6.3, as was done in the first step, one can easily see that $\varepsilon_i \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_i(G_n)^{2q}] = o(1)$ when

$$\varepsilon_i(m_{i+1}d_n)^{2q} = o(1), \quad (6.16)$$

$$\varepsilon_i m_{i+1}^q \sigma_{l_{i+1}}^{2q}(G_n) = o(1) \quad (6.17)$$

$$\text{and } \varepsilon_i m_{i+1} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{l_{i+1}}(G_n)^{2q}] = o(1). \quad (6.18)$$

Now Condition (6.16) holds by Claim 1, Condition (6.17) holds by Claim 2 and Condition (6.18) holds by the hypothesis as $\varepsilon_{i+1} = \varepsilon_i m_{i+1}$.

Hence if we stop at step t , we see that the central limit theorem holds when $\varepsilon_t \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_t(G_n)^{2q}] = o(1)$. By the upper bound for the $2q$ -th moment from Proposition 5.1 (as $d_n^2 = o(l_t)$) we see that $\varepsilon_t \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_t(G_n)^{2q}] \leq \varepsilon_t l_t^q$ and by the lower bound for the variance from (6.10) we have

$$\varepsilon_t l_t^q \leq \frac{cm_1 m_2 \cdots m_t l_t^q k_n^q}{n^q} = \frac{ck_n^q}{(m_1 m_2 \cdots m_t)^{q-1}} = o\left(\frac{n^{q\theta\alpha}}{n^{(q-1)(1-\beta_t)}}\right).$$

The last condition also holds by our assumption (6.11) that $q\theta\alpha \leq (q-1)(1-\beta_t)$. Thus we are done when $l_1 = m_2 m_3 \cdots m_t l_t$.

Now, in general we have $l_{i-1} = m_i l_i + r_i$ for $i = 2, \dots, t$ where $0 \leq r_i < l_i$ for all i . Using the same proof used in the case when all $r_i = 0$, one can easily see from Claim 3, that we need to prove the extra conditions that

$$\varepsilon_i \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{r_i}(G_n)^{2q}] = o(1) \text{ for all } i = 2, 3, \dots, t. \quad (6.19)$$

Fix $i \in \{2, 3, \dots, t\}$. If $r_i \leq l_t$ then we are done since $\varepsilon_i \leq \varepsilon_t$ and by Proposition 5.1 we have $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_{r_i}(G_n)^{2q}] \leq c(d_n^{2q} + l_t^q) \leq c_1 l_t^q$. The last inequality follows since $2\alpha < \beta_t$. Now suppose that $l_{j+1} \leq r_i < l_j$ for some $j \geq i$. Since we have $\varepsilon_i \leq \varepsilon_j$ for $j \geq i$ working with r_i instead of l_j and using the same inductive analysis used before we have the required result (6.19). $\square$

6.6. Choosing the sequence. To complete the proof of Theorem 2.1 we need to choose an appropriate sequence $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_t)$ in (6.11) which will be provided by Lemma 6.5. Note that

$$\frac{1 - 2(\beta_0 - \beta_1) - (1 - \beta_0)/q}{2 + \theta} = \frac{2\beta_1 - 1}{2 + \theta}$$

for $\beta_0 = 1$ and we have noted earlier in (6.6) that

$$\frac{a_n(G_n) - \mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)]}{\text{Var}(a_n(G_n))^{1/2}} \text{ has the same asymptotic limit as } \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m X_i^{(n)} - m\mu_l(G_n)}{\sqrt{m}\sigma_l(G_n)}$$

when $d_n = o(n^\alpha)$ and $\alpha \leq (2\beta_1 - 1)/(2 + \theta)$.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_t$ be t real numbers satisfying the system of linear equations*

$$\frac{1 - 2(\beta_i - \beta_{i+1}) - (1 - \beta_i)/q}{2 + \theta} = \frac{q-1}{q} \cdot \frac{1 - \beta_t}{\theta} \quad (6.20)$$

for all $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, t-1$ where $\beta_0 = 1$. Then we have

$$\beta_i := 1 - \frac{q\theta(1 - r^i)}{\theta + (q-1)(2 + \theta)(1 - r^t)} \quad (6.21)$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ where $r = 1 - 1/(2q)$.

Proof. Define $x_i = 1 - \beta_i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, t$. Clearly $x_0 = 0$. Also define the constants

$$c = \frac{q-1}{q} \cdot \frac{2 + \theta}{\theta} \text{ and } r = 1 - \frac{1}{2q}.$$

Then the system of equations (6.20) can be written in terms of x_i 's as

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - 2x_{i+1} + 2rx_i &= cx_t \text{ for all } i = 0, 1, \dots, t-1 \\ \text{or } x_{i+1} - rx_i &= (1 - cx_t)/2 \text{ for all } i = 0, 1, \dots, t-1. \end{aligned} \quad (6.22)$$

Multiplying the i -th equation by r^{-i-1} and summing over $i = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$ we have

$$r^{-t}x_t = qr^{-t}(cx_t - 1)(r^t - 1) \text{ or } x_t = \frac{q(1 - r^t)}{1 + qc(1 - r^t)}.$$

Now solving (6.22) recursively starting from $i = t-1, t-2, \dots, 0$ we have

$$x_i = \frac{q(1 - r^i)}{1 + qc(1 - r^t)} \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, t.$$

Simplifying and reverting back to β_i we finally get

$$x_i = 1 - \frac{q\theta(1 - r^i)}{\theta + (q-1)(2 + \theta)(1 - r^t)}$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$. □

6.7. Completing the proof. Now we connect all the loose ends to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Recall that the number of edges satisfies $k_n = O(d_n^\theta)$ and moreover we have $d_n = o(n^\alpha)$ for some $\alpha < 1$. We also have $l \sim n^\beta, m \sim n^{1-\beta}$ for some $\beta \in (\alpha, 1)$. We have proved in (6.6) that the CLT will follow if we can find some $\beta \in (\alpha, 1)$ such that $\alpha \leq (2\beta - 1)/(2 + \theta)$ and

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m X_i - m\mu_l(G_n)}{\sqrt{m\sigma_l(G_n)}} \implies N(0, 1) \quad (6.23)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ where X_i 's are i.i.d. having distribution $T_l(G_n)$. Note that $(2\beta - 1)/(2 + \theta) < \beta/2$ for all $\beta > 0$. From Lemma 6.4 we see that (6.23) holds when

$$\alpha \leq \frac{p-2}{p} \cdot \frac{1-\beta}{\theta}.$$

Now an easy calculus exercise gives that

$$\sup_{0 < \beta < 1} \left\{ \min \left(\frac{2\beta - 1}{2 + \theta}, \frac{(p-2)(1-\beta)}{p\theta} \right) \right\} = \left(2 + \theta + \frac{2p\theta}{p-2} \right)^{-1}$$

with the supremum achieved at $\beta = 1 - p\theta/(2p\theta + (p-2)(2+\theta))$.

Now to improve the bound on α we will use the second condition in Lemma 6.4. Assume that $\mathbb{E}[\omega^{2q}] < \infty$ for some integer $q > 1$. From Lemma 6.4 we see that CLT will hold in (6.23) if there exist $t \geq 2$ real numbers $\beta_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ such that $2\alpha < \beta_t < \beta_{t-1} < \dots < \beta_1 < \beta_0 = 1$ and

$$\alpha \leq \frac{q-1}{q} \cdot \frac{1-\beta_t}{\theta} \text{ and } \alpha \leq \frac{1-2(\beta_i - \beta_{i+1}) - (1-\beta_i)/q}{2+\theta} \quad (6.24)$$

for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$.

Now fix any integer $t \geq 2$. Define $r = 1 - 1/2q$. For $i = 1, \dots, t$, define

$$\beta_i := 1 - \frac{q\theta(1-r^i)}{\theta + (q-1)(2+\theta)(1-r^t)}. \quad (6.25)$$

As usual we will assume that $\beta_0 = 1$. Clearly $\beta_t < \beta_{t-1} < \dots < \beta_1 < \beta_0$. The sequence $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_t)$ is the unique solution to the system of equations given by equality in the right hand side of (6.24) (see Lemma 6.5). In fact we have

$$\frac{q-1}{q} \cdot \frac{1-\beta_t}{\theta} = \frac{(q-1)(1-r^t)}{\theta + (q-1)(2+\theta)(1-r^t)}$$

and

$$\frac{1-2(\beta_i - \beta_{i+1}) - (1-\beta_i)/q}{2+\theta} = \frac{(q-1)(1-r^t)}{\theta + (q-1)(2+\theta)(1-r^t)}$$

for any $i = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$. Now note that

$$\frac{2(q-1)(1-r^t)}{\theta + (q-1)(2+\theta)(1-r^t)} < 1 - \frac{q\theta(1-r^t)}{\theta + (q-1)(2+\theta)(1-r^t)} = \beta_t$$

as $\theta + (q-1)(2+\theta)(1-r^t) - (2(q-1) + q\theta)(1-r^t) = \theta r^t > 0$. Thus combining all the previous results we have

$$\frac{a_n(G_n) - \mathbb{E}[a_n(G_n)]}{\sqrt{m\sigma_l(G_n)}} \implies N(0,1) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

when

$$\alpha \leq \frac{(q-1)(1-r^t)}{\theta + (q-1)(2+\theta)(1-r^t)}$$

for some integer $t \geq 2$. Since $r = 1 - 1/2q < 1$, letting $t \rightarrow \infty$ we get the CLT when

$$\alpha < \frac{q-1}{\theta + (q-1)(2+\theta)}.$$

Thus we are done. $\square$

7. THE CASE OF FIXED GRAPH G

By the arguments given in Section 2, we have a Gaussian central limit theorem for $a_n(G)$ and $T_n(G)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ after proper scaling when G is a fixed graph. Proposition 2.1 says that

$$\nu(G) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[T_n(G)]}{n}$$

exists and is positive. Moreover, Proposition 2.2 gives that

$$0 < c_1 \leq \frac{\text{Var}(T_n(G))}{n} \leq c_2$$

for all n for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ depending on G . The next lemma says that in fact we can say more. Assume that $v(G)$ is the number of vertices in G , $k(G)$ is the number of edges in G and $D = D(G)$ is the diameter of G .

Lemma 7.1. *Let G be a finite connected graph. Then we have*

$$|\mathbb{E}[T_n(G)] - n\nu(G)| \leq \mu D \text{ for all } n$$

and the limit

$$\sigma^2(G) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma_n^2(G)}{n}$$

exists and is positive.

Proof. Let $\tilde{\mu}_n = \mu_n/n$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_n^2 = \sigma_n^2/n$. Using the proof given in corollary 6.2 we have

$$|n\tilde{\mu}_n - (ml\tilde{\mu}_l + r\tilde{\mu}_r)| \leq m\mu D \text{ and } \left| (n\tilde{\sigma}_n^2)^{1/2} - (ml\tilde{\sigma}_l^2 + r\tilde{\sigma}_r^2)^{1/2} \right| \leq mbD \quad (7.1)$$

for all $n = ml + r$ with $0 \leq r < l$ where $b = (\mu^2 + \sigma^2)^{1/2}$. Thus for any m, k we have $|\tilde{\mu}_{mk} - \tilde{\mu}_m| \leq \mu D/m$. Reversing the roles of m and k , and combining, we see that for any m, k , we have

$$|\tilde{\mu}_m - \tilde{\mu}_k| \leq \mu D/k + \mu D/m.$$

Taking limits as $k \rightarrow \infty$ we have, for any m ,

$$|\tilde{\mu}_m - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mu}_n| \leq \mu D/m.$$

For the variance, we take $n = 2l$ in equation (7.1) to have

$$|\tilde{\sigma}_{2l} - \tilde{\sigma}_l| \leq bD(2/l)^{1/2}.$$

Hence, it follows that $\tilde{\sigma}_{2^k}$ is Cauchy and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\sigma}_{2^k}$ exists.

Now take any $l \geq 1$. There exists a unique positive integer $k = k(l)$ such that $2l^{3/2} \leq 2^k < 4l^{3/2}$ ($k(l) = 1 + \lceil \log_2 l^{3/2} \rceil$). Suppose $2^k = ml + r$ where $0 \leq r < l$. Clearly $\sqrt{l} \leq m \leq 4\sqrt{l}$. Now from (7.1) we have,

$$\left| (2^k \tilde{\sigma}_{2^k}^2)^{1/2} - (ml \tilde{\sigma}_l^2 + r \tilde{\sigma}_r^2)^{1/2} \right| \leq mbD.$$

Dividing by $2^{k/2}$ on both sides, we get

$$\left| \tilde{\sigma}_{2^k} - \left(\tilde{\sigma}_l^2 + \frac{r(\tilde{\sigma}_r^2 - \tilde{\sigma}_l^2)}{ml + r} \right)^{1/2} \right| \leq \frac{mbD}{\sqrt{ml + r}} \leq 2bDl^{-1/4}.$$

Note that k, m, r are functions of l in the above expression. Among these, $m(l) \geq l^{1/2}$ and $r(l) < l$. Taking $l \rightarrow \infty$, and using the fact that the sequence $\{\tilde{\sigma}_n^2\}_{n \geq 1}$ is uniformly bounded (see Proposition 5.1), we get that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\sigma}_m$ exists and equals $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\sigma}_{2^k}$. Positivity of the limit follows from the variance lower bound given in Proposition 2.2. $\square$

Note that, if we consider the point-to-point cylinder first-passage time $t_n(G)$ in $[0, n] \times G$, the same results given in Lemma 7.1 hold for $\mathbb{E}[t_n(G)]$ and $\text{Var}(t_n(G))$.

Now we consider the process $X(m)$ where $X(m) = t_m(G) - m\nu(G)$ for $m \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ and $X_n(t) = X_m + (t - m)(X_{m+1} - X_m)$ for $t \in (m, m + 1)$. Note that when G is the trivial graph consisting of a single vertex, $X(n)$ corresponds to random walk with linear interpolation and by Donsker's theorem $\{(n\sigma^2)^{-1/2}X(nt)\}_{t \geq 0}$ converges to Brownian motion. The next lemma says that for general G we also have the same behavior. We assume that $\mathbb{E}[\omega^p] < \infty$ for some $p > 2$ where $\omega \sim F$.

Lemma 7.2. *The scaled process $\{(n\sigma^2(G))^{-1/2}X(nt)\}_{t \geq 0}$ converges in distribution to standard Brownian motion as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Consider the continuous process X' defined as $X'(n) := T_n(G) - n\nu(G)$ for $n \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ and extended by linear interpolation. By Lemma 3.1 it is enough to prove Brownian convergence for $\{Y_n(t) := (n\sigma^2(G))^{-1/2}X'(nt) : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ for any fixed $T > 0$. To prove the result it suffices to show that the finite dimensional distributions of $Y_n(t)$ converge weakly to those of B_t and that $\{Y_n\}$ is tight.

First of all note that for any $s > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_n(s) - (n\sigma^2(G))^{-1/2}X(\lfloor ns \rfloor)| &\leq (n\sigma^2(G))^{-1/2}|X'(1 + \lfloor ns \rfloor) - X'(\lfloor ns \rfloor)| \\ &\leq (n\sigma^2(G))^{-1/2}(Z + \nu(G)) \xrightarrow{P} 0 \end{aligned}$$

where Z is the maximum of all the edge weights connecting $\{\lfloor ns \rfloor\} \times G$ to $\{1 + \lfloor ns \rfloor\} \times G$, which has the distribution of maximum of $v(G)$ many i.i.d. random variables each having distribution F . Thus it is enough to prove finite dimensional distributional convergence of the process $\{W_n(t) := (n\sigma^2(G))^{-1/2} X'(\lfloor nt \rfloor)\}_{t \geq 0}$. For a fixed $t > 0$, using Theorem 2.1 we have $W_n(t) \Rightarrow N(0, t)$ since $\lfloor nt \rfloor/n \rightarrow t$.

For $0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_l < \infty$, define $V_i = T_{\lfloor nt_{i-1} \rfloor, \lfloor nt_i \rfloor}(G) - (\lfloor nt_i \rfloor - \lfloor nt_{i-1} \rfloor)\nu(G)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, l$. Clearly V_i 's are independent for all i . Moreover using Lemma 6.1 we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|W_n(t_i) - W_n(t_{i-1}) - (n\sigma^2(G))^{-1/2}V_i|] \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all i . Thus by independence and by CLT for $(n\sigma^2(G))^{-1/2}V_i$, we have

$$(W_n(t_i) - W_n(t_{i-1}))_{i=1}^l \Rightarrow (B_{t_i} - B_{t_{i-1}})_{i=1}^l \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

To prove tightness for $\{Y_n(\cdot)\}$, first of all note that certainly $\{Y_n(0)\}$ is tight as $Y_n(0) \equiv 0$. Also it is enough to prove tightness for $\{W_n(\cdot)\}$. We will prove tightness via the following lemma.

Lemma 7.3 (Billingsley [4], page 87-91). *The sequence $\{W_n\}$ is tight if there exist constants $C \geq 0$ and $\lambda > 1/2$ such that for all $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 < t_3$ and for all n , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[|W_n(t_2) - W_n(t_1)|^{2\lambda} |W_n(t_3) - W_n(t_2)|^{2\lambda}] \leq C|t_2 - t_1|^\lambda |t_3 - t_2|^\lambda.$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Proposition 5.1, it is easy to see that Lemma 7.3 holds with $\lambda = p/4$. Thus we are done. $\square$

8. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Itai Benjamini for initiating the investigation by suggesting that a CLT may hold for cylinders with fixed diameter.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. S. Alexander, *Approximation of subadditive functions and convergence rates in limiting-shape results*, Ann. Probab. **25** (1997), no. 1, 30–55.
- [2] J. Baik and T. M. Suidan, *A GUE central limit theorem and universality of directed first and last passage site percolation*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2005), no. 6, 325–337.
- [3] I. Benjamini, G. Kalai, and O. Schramm, *First passage percolation has sublinear distance variance*, Ann. Probab. **31** (2003), no. 4, 1970–1978.
- [4] P. Billingsley, *Convergence of probability measures*, John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1968.
- [5] T. Bodineau and J. Martin, *A universality property for last-passage percolation paths close to the axis*, Electron. Comm. Probab. **10** (2005), 105–112 (electronic).
- [6] S. Boucheron, O. Bousquet, G. Lugosi, and P. Massart, *Moment inequalities for functions of independent random variables*, Ann. Probab. **33** (2005), no. 2, 514–560.
- [7] J. T. Chayes, L. Chayes, and R. Durrett, *Critical behavior of the two-dimensional first passage time*, J. Statist. Phys. **45** (1986), no. 5-6, 933–951.
- [8] J. T. Cox and R. Durrett, *Some limit theorems for percolation processes with necessary and sufficient conditions*, Ann. Probab. **9** (1981), no. 4, 583–603.

- [9] J. Gravner, C. A. Tracy, and H. Widom, *Limit theorems for height fluctuations in a class of discrete space and time growth models*, J. Statist. Phys. **102** (2001), no. 5-6, 1085–1132.
- [10] G. Grimmett and H. Kesten, *First-passage percolation, network flows and electrical resistances*, Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete **66** (1984), no. 3, 335–366.
- [11] J. M. Hammersley and D. J. A. Welsh, *First-passage percolation, subadditive processes, stochastic networks, and generalized renewal theory*, Proc. Internat. Res. Semin., Statist. Lab., Univ. California, Berkeley, Calif, 1965, pp. 61–110.
- [12] K. Johansson, *Shape fluctuations and random matrices*, Comm. Math. Phys. **209** (2000), no. 2, 437–476.
- [13] K. Johansson, *Discrete orthogonal polynomial ensembles and the Plancherel measure*, Ann. of Math. (2) **153** (2001), no. 1, 259–296.
- [14] M. Kardar, G. Parisi, and Y. C. Zhang, *Dynamic scaling of growing interfaces*, Physical Review Letters **56** (1986), no. 9, 889–892.
- [15] H. Kesten and Y. Zhang, *A central limit theorem for “critical” first-passage percolation in two dimensions*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **107** (1997), no. 2, 137–160.
- [16] H. Kesten, *Aspects of first passage percolation*, École d’été de probabilités de Saint-Flour, XIV—1984, 1986, pp. 125–264.
- [17] H. Kesten, *On the speed of convergence in first-passage percolation*, Ann. Appl. Probab. **3** (1993), no. 2, 296–338.
- [18] J. Krug and H. Spohn, *Kinetic roughening of growing surfaces*, Solids far from equilibrium (1991), 479–582.
- [19] C. Licea, C. M. Newman, and M. S. T. Piza, *Superdiffusivity in first-passage percolation*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **106** (1996), no. 4, 559–591.
- [20] C. M. Newman and M. S. T. Piza, *Divergence of shape fluctuations in two dimensions*, Ann. Probab. **23** (1995), no. 3, 977–1005.
- [21] Y. Peres and R. Pemantle, *Planar first-passage percolation times are not tight*, Probability and phase transition (G. Grimmett, ed.) (1994), 261–264.
- [22] D. Richardson, *Random growth in a tessellation*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **74** (1973), 515–528.
- [23] R. T. Smythe and J. C. Wierman, *First-passage percolation on the square lattice*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 671, Springer, Berlin, 1978.
- [24] T. Suidan, *A remark on a theorem of Chatterjee and last passage percolation*, J. Phys. A **39** (2006), no. 28, 8977–8981.
- [25] M. Talagrand, *Concentration of measure and isoperimetric inequalities in product spaces*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1995), no. 81, 73–205.
- [26] Y. Zhang, *Shape fluctuations are different in different directions*, Ann. Probab. **36** (2008), no. 1, 331–362.

SOURAV CHATTERJEE

367 EVANS HALL #3860, DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, BERKELEY, CA 94720-3860.

EMAIL: sourav@stat.Berkeley.EDU

URL: <http://www.stat.berkeley.edu/~sourav>

PARTHA SARATHI DEY

367 EVANS HALL #3860, DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY, BERKELEY, CA 94720-3860.

EMAIL: partha@stat.Berkeley.EDU

URL: <http://www.stat.berkeley.edu/~partha>